Journal of Next-Generation Research 5.0 (JNGR 5.0)
ISSN: **3075-2868** Website: www.jngr5.com Email: editor@jngr5.com

Insider Trading Challenges in the Digital Era: Legal and Ethical Considerations for U.S. Financial Market Regulation

Zakaria Garno

Euromed University of Fes, Morocco

Abstract

Digital technologies have profoundly transformed financial markets, introducing both opportunities and challenges for regulatory frameworks. This paper critically explores the complexities of regulating insider trading in the U.S. financial markets, focusing on emerging technologies such as blockchain, smart contracts, and artificial intelligence. While these innovations promise enhanced transparency and efficiency, they simultaneously obscure accountability, complicate enforcement, and expand the interpretative scope of insider trading laws. The transition to decentralized platforms and automated trading systems has disrupted jurisdictional boundaries and amplified regulatory gaps. This study examines these disruptions through the lens of key legal principles and case law, highlighting the urgent need for adaptive legal reforms to maintain market integrity in the digital age.

Keywords: Insider Trading, Digital Era, Financial Market Regulation, Blockchain Technology, Smart Contracts, Ethical Considerations, U.S. Securities Law

1. Introduction

The integrity and fairness of financial markets are cornerstones of modern economic systems. However, insider trading—the misuse of material, non-public information for securities trading—erodes investor confidence and market efficiency (1). While regulators have developed robust frameworks to counteract insider trading over the decades, the advent of digital technologies, particularly blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI), has fundamentally disrupted traditional paradigms of enforcement and detection. These technologies, heralded for their promise of unprecedented transparency and efficiency, have simultaneously created avenues for exploitation that challenge existing legal structures (2).

Blockchain's decentralized and pseudonymous design, while offering immutable and transparent transaction records, complicates the attribution of trades to specific actors, thus undermining efforts to enforce accountability (3). Similarly, AI-driven trading algorithms, with their ability to process vast datasets and generate predictive trading insights, operate at speeds beyond human comprehension. That raises the specter of predictive insider trading, where machine-learning systems exploit informational asymmetries to gain undue advantage (4). Together, these

innovations blur traditional legal boundaries, expand the scope of what constitutes insider trading, and expose critical vulnerabilities in regulatory frameworks.

Despite the rapid adoption of these technologies, regulatory responses remain fragmented and reactive, struggling to keep pace with the evolution of market practices. Current legal tools, including the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and SEC Rule 10b-5, while foundational, were not designed to address the complexities of blockchain-enabled pseudonymity or the opacity of AI-driven decision-making processes (5, 6).

Furthermore, global financial markets are increasingly interconnected, necessitating coordinated international efforts to prevent regulatory arbitrage and ensure consistent enforcement across jurisdictions (7, 8). This paper critically examines how blockchain and AI disrupt the U.S. regulatory landscape governing insider trading. It provides a detailed analysis of key legal frameworks and landmark cases, including Salman v. United States and the more recent Meadow/Teixeira case, to illuminate the gaps in current enforcement practices. Additionally, it evaluates recent legislative developments and the ethical challenges these technologies pose, particularly in balancing transparency with privacy and accountability. By focusing on these two transformative technologies, this study seeks to offer actionable proposals for regulatory adaptation, emphasizing the urgency of safeguarding market integrity in the digital era.

2. Historical and Legal Framework

The U.S. regulatory framework for insider trading has evolved significantly since the enactment of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which sought to restore investor confidence in the aftermath of the 1929 market crash. This landmark legislation empowered the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to oversee securities markets and enforce rules against market manipulation and insider trading (9). Over the decades, this framework has adapted to shifting market dynamics, technological advances, and evolving trading practices, reflecting a consistent effort to safeguard market integrity.

2.1 Early foundations

Expansion of SEC enforcement

The 1970s and 1980s marked a critical period of growth in SEC enforcement. Notable scandals, such as the Ivan Boesky insider trading case, highlighted systemic vulnerabilities in financial markets and spurred the development of stricter compliance measures (10). These high-profile cases catalyzed regulatory reform, expanding the SEC's investigative powers and shaping its enforcement priorities. During this time, landmark cases such as United States v. Newman and Dirks v. SEC refined the legal contours of insider trading, introducing critical concepts such as tipper/tippee liability and the "personal benefit test"(6).

2.2 Legislative reforms

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002

In response to the corporate accounting scandals of the early 2000s, including Enron and WorldCom, Congress passed the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX). This legislation introduced sweeping reforms to enhance corporate governance and accountability, including provisions to

curb insider trading. Section 306(a) of SOX, which prohibits trades during blackout periods, sought to eliminate insider advantages during sensitive corporate events, reinforcing fairness in securities markets (11). Additionally, SOX imposed stricter penalties for insider trading violations and required greater transparency in financial reporting, bolstering investor protection and market integrity (12).

The Dodd-Frank Act of 2010

The 2008 global financial crisis exposed significant gaps in regulatory oversight, leading to the enactment of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010. This legislation expanded the SEC's enforcement capabilities and introduced the Whistleblower Program, which incentivizes individuals to report insider trading through monetary rewards and anti-retaliation protections. The program has been instrumental in uncovering violations, such as in the Vikram Pandit investigation(13, 14).

Dodd-Frank also enhanced international regulatory coordination, leveraging Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and frameworks like the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) to address cross-border misconduct in global financial markets (7, 15).

2.3 Adapting to technology

Adapting to technological challenges

While these legislative milestones have strengthened regulatory enforcement, the rise of blockchain, artificial intelligence (AI), and high-frequency trading (HFT) introduces complexities existing frameworks struggle to address. For example, blockchain's decentralized and pseudonymous architecture complicates the identification of insider trading activities, as transactions are anonymized yet publicly recorded (3). Similarly, AI-driven algorithms leverage vast datasets to predict market movements at speeds that outpace human oversight, creating opportunities for predictive insider trading and market manipulation (4).

To counter these challenges, the SEC has adopted technological innovations such as the Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) and AI-powered surveillance systems, enabling real-time monitoring of complex trading activities. However, the effectiveness of these tools is contingent on continual updates to legal and regulatory frameworks to address emerging risks (16, 17).

Maintaining market integrity

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the reforms introduced by SOX and Dodd-Frank have created a regulatory environment centered on transparency, accountability, and fairness. The SEC's proactive adoption of advanced technologies and evolving enforcement strategies reflect its commitment to addressing modern challenges. However, as financial markets increasingly rely on digital platforms, insider trading practices continue to evolve, underscoring the need for dynamic and globally coordinated regulatory adaptations (8, 18). These efforts are critical to maintaining investor trust and preserving the integrity of financial markets in the digital age.

3. Comparative Analysis of Landmark Legal Cases in Insider Trading

The evolution of insider trading enforcement in the United States is best illustrated by critically examining six landmark cases. These cases highlight the development of securities law enforcement, the regulatory response to market complexities, and the ongoing challenges emerging technologies pose.

3.1 Evolution of legal principles

SEC v. Texas Gulf Sulphur (1966)

This seminal case established the "disclose or abstain" principle, a foundational rule in insider trading enforcement. The court held that individuals possessing material, non-public information must disclose it before trading or abstaining from trading entirely. The decision reinforced the ethical requirement of market fairness and set a standard for preventing the exploitation of insider information. However, the ruling did not address other forms of market manipulation, underscoring the need for broader regulatory frameworks to encompass evolving trading practices (19) (Dooley, 1980).

United States v. O'Hagan (1997)

This case expanded insider trading jurisprudence by introducing the misappropriation theory, which holds that individuals who misuse confidential information for personal gain, even if they are not traditional insiders, can be prosecuted. The ruling extended the scope of insider trading to encompass breaches of trust and fiduciary duties. While the decision strengthened enforcement, it left ambiguities regarding the limits of the misappropriation theory, creating legal gray areas that persist in modern financial markets (6).

Viky Bohra case (2020–2021)

This case underscored the enforcement of Sarbanes-Oxley Act Section 306(a), which prohibits insider trading during designated blackout periods by corporate insiders. The SEC's prosecution demonstrated its commitment to ensuring fair trading practices, particularly when insider knowledge might confer unfair advantages. However, proving trades occurred during blackout periods remains a significant evidentiary challenge, particularly as trading technologies evolve and compliance systems face implementation hurdles (11).

3.2 Insights from selected cases

Amit Dagar Case (2021)

Focusing on the misuse of sensitive pharmaceutical data, this case highlighted the ethical and legal responsibilities of safeguarding proprietary research findings. The insider trading involved Pfizer trial data, emphasizing the risks of exploitation in high-stakes industries. The SEC leveraged advanced detection methods, showcasing the critical role of technological tools like algorithmic surveillance in identifying illicit activities. The case also pointed to gaps in broader corporate governance mechanisms that could mitigate such violations (20).

Meadow/Teixeira case (2023)

This case clarified the responsibilities and breaches of trust in tipper/tippee liability scenarios. It reinforced that fiduciary duties extend beyond direct insiders to those who receive and act upon material, non-public information. The court examined the complexities of personal benefit

requirements and fiduciary relationships, setting precedents that influence future insider trading litigation. However, the case highlighted the difficulty of tracing knowledge flows and benefits in such relationships, necessitating more robust evidentiary standards (21).

Terran Peizer case (2023)

This case marked a significant milestone by addressing the vulnerabilities of 10b5-1 trading plans. The SEC's enforcement focused on the accuracy of initial representations in the setup process of these plans and led to stricter rules effective February 27, 2023. These rules enhanced transparency and accountability, addressing manipulative practices that exploit automated trading systems. While a regulatory milestone, the case also revealed the persistent risks of exploitation in high-frequency trading environments (17).

3.3 Lessons for U.S. regulation

Challenges emerging from technological advancements

The cases also reveal how advancements in technology complicate enforcement and compliance. For example:

- **Blockchain technology:** While enhancing transparency through immutable ledgers, blockchain's pseudonymous nature poses significant challenges for tracing asset ownership and identifying perpetrators of insider trading (17).
- **Smart contracts:** These self-executing digital agreements can bypass traditional legal safeguards, creating regulatory blind spots in automated transactions (22).
- **High-Frequency Trading (HFT):** Algorithmic trading systems execute trades at speeds and volumes that outpace traditional regulatory monitoring, introducing opacity into trading patterns (23) .

Lessons for U.S. legislation and regulatory adaptation

Each case offers critical lessons for refining insider trading laws to address contemporary challenges:

Clear guidelines for insider information: The Texas Gulf Sulphur case emphasized the need for unambiguous rules on handling material, non-public information.

Expansion of enforcement theories: The O'Hagan case demonstrated the importance of extending insider trading laws to cover non-traditional actors, such as those misappropriating confidential information.

Strengthened compliance measures: The Bohra case highlighted the need for rigorous systems to enforce blackout rules effectively.

Industry-specific safeguards: The Dagar case underscored the importance of robust oversight mechanisms in industries handling sensitive data.

Enhanced fiduciary standards: The Meadow/Teixeira case called for clearer legal definitions of fiduciary duties in tipper/tippee relationships.

Modernized trading rules: The Peizer case showcased the necessity of adapting SEC rules to counter manipulative practices in trading plans.

4. Global Perspectives on Insider Trading Regulation

Insider trading regulations vary significantly across jurisdictions, each adopting frameworks tailored to their legal traditions and market dynamics. A detailed comparative analysis of the European Union (EU), Japan, the United Kingdom (UK), and France reveals critical lessons and potential pathways for U.S. regulatory reforms.

4.1 Comparative analysis of key approaches

European Union (EU): Market Abuse Regulation (MAR)

The EU's Market Abuse Regulation (MAR) establishes a unified, directly applicable framework to ensure consistency in market conduct across member states.

- **Key features:** MAR defines insider trading as part of broader market abuse, mandating strict disclosure obligations and preventative measures. Its focus on uniformity and transparency reduces regulatory fragmentation (24).
- **Proactive measures:** Transparency requirements and mandatory insider lists ensure real-time monitoring and reduce opportunities for abuse (24).
- **Enforcement:** The European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) coordinates enforcement actions, harmonizing penalties across member states to maintain market integrity.
- **U.S. comparisons:** MAR contrasts with the U.S.'s fragmented reliance on statutory and case law, offering a more cohesive approach that could address gaps in American enforcement frameworks.

Japan: Financial Instruments and Exchange Act (FIEA)

Japan's regulatory environment emphasizes a culture of compliance and precision in transactional scrutiny.

- **Key features:** The FIEA imposes stringent monitoring obligations on securities firms and public companies, with a focus on market integrity and fairness (21).
- **Technological adaptation:** Japan employs advanced transaction surveillance systems and mandates extensive record-keeping to detect irregularities effectively (7).
- **Enforcement:** The Financial Services Agency (FSA) oversees enforcement with swift penalties for violations, underscoring a zero-tolerance approach.
- **U.S. comparisons:** Japan's data-driven surveillance and meticulous record-keeping offer valuable insights for improving the U.S.'s capacity to oversee high-frequency and algorithmic trading.

United Kingdom (UK): adapting the EU framework post-Brexit

Post-Brexit, the UK has retained key elements of the EU's MAR while tailoring its framework to align with local legal principles.

- **Key features:** The Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 (FSMA), supplemented by UK MAR, emphasizes proactive disclosure and market surveillance (20).
- **Principle-based regulation:** The UK's approach is less prescriptive, allowing flexibility to adapt enforcement to evolving market conditions (25).

- **Enforcement:** The Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) ensures robust oversight with substantial penalties for misconduct. Collaborative public-private partnerships enhance compliance.
- **U.S. Comparisons:** The UK's principle-based regulatory approach contrasts with the U.S.'s rule-based system, offering lessons in balancing flexibility with robust enforcement.

France: integration of MAR and AMF's enforcement model

France's regulatory framework integrates MAR seamlessly into its national laws, emphasizing rigorous enforcement and transparency.

- **Key features:** The Autorité des Marchés Financiers (AMF) enforces disclosure requirements and monitors insider trading through publicized actions that deter misconduct (24).
- **Cross-Border Cooperation:** France's alignment with EU standards and proactive involvement in cross-border cases strengthen its regulatory influence.
- **Enforcement:** High-profile cases and significant penalties showcase the AMF's commitment to market integrity, with a focus on real-time public disclosure (7).
- **U.S. comparisons:** France's integration of MAR highlights the advantages of harmonized regulations, which the U.S. could adopt to streamline oversight and enhance international cooperation.

4.2 Key takeaways for U.S. framework

- MAR's robust focus on mandatory disclosure and transparency ensures consistent enforcement across jurisdictions. The U.S. could adopt similar real-time disclosure measures to reduce opportunities for abuse.
- Japan's use of advanced transaction monitoring and data analytics highlights the importance of integrating technology into regulatory frameworks. This approach could strengthen the SEC's oversight of high-frequency and algorithmic trading.
- The UK's principle-based approach balances regulatory flexibility with enforcement rigor, offering a valuable model for addressing the rapid evolution of digital trading technologies in the U.S.
- France's commitment to cross-border enforcement and its alignment with EU regulations demonstrate the importance of global cooperation. The U.S. could enhance its partnerships with international regulators to address insider trading in increasingly globalized financial markets.

4.3 International comparative analysis of insider trading regulations

The SEC has undertaken significant regulatory initiatives in recent years to address emerging challenges posed by technological advancements, including digital assets, algorithmic trading, and cybersecurity threats. While these changes have not amended the foundational Securities Exchange Act of 1934, they demonstrate the SEC's strategic focus on adapting to the complexities of modern financial markets.

Regulation of digital assets and blockchain-based securities (2019–Present)

With the exponential growth of cryptocurrencies and blockchain technology, the SEC has extended its regulatory framework by classifying many digital assets as securities. This strategic application of the Howey Test ensures that digital tokens fall under securities laws.

- **Recent developments:**

The SEC has issued formal guidance and enforcement actions targeting non-compliant crypto projects, including high-profile cases like SEC v. Ripple Labs Inc. (2020–2023). These cases emphasize the agency's commitment to enforcing anti-fraud and disclosure provisions for blockchain-based securities (18, 17).

- **Market implications:**

By regulating Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) and tokenized assets, the SEC addresses concerns over market manipulation and insider trading in decentralized environments. The adoption of blockchain analytics tools further strengthens enforcement efforts by uncovering pseudonymous trading patterns (26).

Implementation of the Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT)

The SEC's rollout of the Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) represents a landmark development in market surveillance. CAT consolidates data from all U.S. securities markets, enabling comprehensive monitoring of orders, modifications, and executions.

- **Key advancements:**

Fully operational by 2022, CAT provides regulators with unprecedented real-time access to market activity, enhancing their ability to detect insider trading and other illicit practices. This initiative specifically targets challenges posed by high-frequency and algorithmic trading (27).

- **Impact on enforcement:**

CAT's integration with AI-driven analytics allows the SEC to monitor large-scale data sets efficiently, identifying anomalies indicative of market abuse, including spoofing and layering strategies (28).

Cybersecurity protocols and their relevance to insider trading

In response to escalating cyber threats, the SEC introduced stricter cybersecurity requirements for market participants, focusing on risk management and disclosure.

- **Cybersecurity risk management proposal (2022):**

This proposed rule requires investment advisors and funds to implement and disclose robust cybersecurity measures. It emphasizes reporting cyber incidents to the SEC within 48 hours, demonstrating the agency's commitment to protecting market-sensitive data (28).

- **Relevance to insider trading:**

Cyberattacks often expose material non-public information (MNPI), creating opportunities for insider trading. The SEC's heightened focus on cybersecurity aims to reduce this risk, reinforcing the integrity of U.S. financial markets.

Algorithmic and high-frequency trading regulation

The rise of algorithmic and high-frequency trading (HFT) has introduced new complexities in market oversight. In collaboration with FINRA, the SEC has adopted measures to enhance transparency and accountability in automated trading systems.

- **New registration rules:**

Developers of algorithmic trading systems are now required to register as Securities Traders, ensuring regulatory scrutiny of their trading strategies (29).

- **Recent enforcement:**

The SEC has levied fines against firms engaging in manipulative algorithmic practices, such as quote stuffing, highlighting the agency's commitment to fair trading practices (21).

- **AI integration in oversight:**

Leveraging machine learning and AI, the SEC has enhanced its ability to monitor and analyze high-frequency trading, identifying patterns of manipulation that were previously undetectable.

The SEC's recent regulatory initiatives reflect a strategic effort to modernize financial oversight in an increasingly digital environment. By addressing challenges posed by digital assets, implementing the Consolidated Audit Trail, enhancing cybersecurity protocols, and regulating algorithmic trading, the SEC has reinforced its commitment to maintaining market transparency and fairness.

5. Technological Impacts on Insider Trading

5.1 Blockchain's impact on insider trading regulation

Blockchain technology fundamentally transforms financial market operations by providing a decentralized, immutable ledger that ensures transparency and deters manipulative practices such as backdating or altering records (21). Each transaction is time-stamped and cannot be tampered with, thereby reducing opportunities for insiders to exploit non-public information (21). This innovation fosters an unprecedented level of trust in financial systems, which has long been a cornerstone of regulatory objectives.

However, the pseudonymous nature of blockchain presents significant challenges for enforcement. While all transactions are transparent and accessible, the identities behind blockchain addresses are often concealed. This anonymity complicates the identification of insider trading and obstructs regulatory efforts to establish accountability (21). Privacy-focused cryptocurrencies such as Monero and Zcash exacerbate this challenge by enabling transactions that are virtually untraceable.

To counter these obstacles, regulators are adopting advanced technologies, including:

Blockchain analytics tools: Platforms like Chainalysis and Elliptic help link blockchain transactions to real-world entities, enabling detection of patterns indicative of insider trading. These tools are already being employed in high-profile regulatory cases (21).

Enhanced KYC protocols: Stricter Know-Your-Customer (KYC) regulations require financial institutions to verify the identities of blockchain wallet holders, ensuring that transactions can be linked to accountable individuals.

AML compliance measures: Anti-Money Laundering (AML) protocols are being adapted to blockchain environments, mandating detailed transaction reporting and flagging suspicious activity to reduce risks of insider trading and market manipulation.

5.2 Complicating factors of blockchain in regulatory oversight

While blockchain's transparency enhances financial market accountability, its decentralized architecture disrupts traditional regulatory mechanisms. Agencies like the SEC and FCA face significant hurdles adapting their oversight strategies to monitor blockchain transactions (30).

The absence of a central authority in blockchain networks creates gaps in jurisdictional reach, making regulatory enforcement challenging.

Additionally, blockchain's pseudonymous nature obstructs compliance with KYC and AML standards. Without supplemental data, regulators struggle to link transactions to real-world identities; a task made more complex by privacy-enhancing technologies (31). This anonymity can facilitate insider trading, mainly when traders use multiple addresses or privacy-focused cryptocurrencies to obscure their activities.

Another challenge lies in smart contracts—self-executing programs that enforce agreements based on pre-coded conditions. While they improve efficiency by eliminating intermediaries, they pose significant compliance risks. For instance, smart contracts can be programmed to execute trades triggered by insider knowledge, effectively bypassing traditional regulatory safeguards designed to detect and prevent market manipulation (31,32).

These complexities demand a shift in regulatory focus:

- **Strategic partnerships with blockchain developers:** Collaborating with blockchain platforms can ensure built-in compliance mechanisms, such as identity verification and real-time reporting.
- **Development of global standards:** The international nature of blockchain necessitates harmonized regulations to prevent jurisdictional arbitrage and ensure consistent enforcement.

5.3 Moving forward with blockchain regulation

To effectively regulate blockchain in financial markets, policymakers must adopt innovative approaches that balance technological benefits with oversight needs. Key strategies include:

Advanced data analytics: The application of artificial intelligence and machine learning to analyze blockchain data can enhance the detection of anomalies, such as insider trading patterns (33).

Mandatory identity disclosures: Linking blockchain addresses to verified identities through mandatory disclosures would enhance accountability without undermining the core transparency of blockchain networks (34).

International regulatory cooperation: Given the cross-border nature of blockchain transactions, harmonized global frameworks are essential. Multilateral agreements could standardize enforcement mechanisms and facilitate information-sharing between jurisdictions (35).

While blockchain introduces complexities in regulatory oversight, it also provides unparalleled opportunities for transparency and accountability. Leveraging its strengths while addressing its challenges will be critical in fostering a compliant and innovative financial market ecosystem.

5.4 Artificial intelligence and machine learning in trading algorithms

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) have redefined trading by processing large datasets, identifying market trends, and supporting predictive decision-making, thereby enhancing market efficiency (36). High-frequency trading algorithms now execute transactions at speeds and volumes that outpace human capabilities, creating both opportunities and risks.

Risks associated with AI in trading:

- **Market manipulation:** Techniques like front-running and quote stuffing exploit informational asymmetries, undermining market integrity(36, 37).
- **Opacity of AI systems:** The "black-box" nature of AI algorithms complicates regulatory oversight, as decision-making processes are not easily interpretable, making it difficult to assess compliance with insider trading laws (38).

Regulatory responses: To address these risks, the SEC and other regulatory bodies are implementing robust frameworks:

1. **AI-powered surveillance tools:** The SEC employs AI to detect unusual trading patterns and identify manipulative behaviors, ensuring faster and more accurate enforcement (38).
2. **Algorithm auditing requirements:** Regulations are being developed to mandate regular auditing of AI trading systems, ensuring compliance with ethical and legal standards (38).
3. **Increased transparency:** Firms are being required to disclose the logic and data inputs underpinning their trading algorithms, enhancing accountability and allowing regulators to assess potential risks (38).

Big data in oversight: The rise of big data has transformed market surveillance, expanding the scope and granularity of oversight. However, it also poses challenges by overwhelming traditional monitoring systems. Integrating AI-powered analytics into regulatory workflows can help manage these complexities, distinguishing between legitimate and illicit activities (38).

Blockchain and AI have profoundly disrupted insider trading regulation, offering both unprecedented transparency and significant challenges. While blockchain deters traditional manipulative practices, its pseudonymous nature and decentralized structure require regulatory innovation. Similarly, AI enhances market efficiency but introduces risks of opaque decision-making and market manipulation.

6. Legal Adjustments in the Digital Age

6.1 Adequacy of current laws

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 remains the cornerstone of U.S. financial market regulation but is increasingly ill-equipped to address the complexities of blockchain and AI-driven trading algorithms. While these technologies promise efficiency and transparency, they also expose critical gaps in oversight and accountability.

Blockchain’s immutable and decentralized structure offers unparalleled transparency by recording transactions chronologically in tamper-proof ledgers. However, its pseudonymous nature complicates regulators' ability to trace transactions back to individuals, creating vulnerabilities for insider trading (39). Similarly, AI-driven trading systems, which process vast datasets to predict market trends, operate at speeds and complexities beyond human oversight, making them susceptible to manipulative practices like quote stuffing or front running (39).

The SEC's reliance on traditional mechanisms such as whistleblower tips and post-hoc investigations has struggled to keep pace with these technological advancements (39). Recent initiatives like the Consolidated Audit Trail (CAT) aim to bridge these gaps, yet enforcement

data shows low efficacy in addressing manipulative behaviors in algorithmic trading systems. That underscores the urgency for adopting advanced regulatory technologies and legal reforms to modernize enforcement capabilities (39).

6.2 Proposals for legal reform

Effective reform hinges on the integration of advanced technologies into regulatory practices and the establishment of clear, forward-looking legal guidelines.

Algorithmic transparency: Firms engaged in high-frequency trading must disclose algorithmic strategies, decision-making logic, and operational logs to enable regulatory scrutiny. This disclosure would help identify manipulative practices, such as algorithms designed to influence closing prices or disrupt market equilibrium (40).

AI-powered surveillance: Expanding the use of AI in real-time market surveillance can significantly enhance the detection of trading anomalies. AI systems can process vast datasets efficiently, uncovering patterns that suggest market manipulation or insider trading(4). These tools must be audited regularly to mitigate risks of biased or inaccurate outputs (4).

Blockchain analytics and compliance: Regulators should adopt tools like Chainalysis to demystify pseudonymous transactions and link them to identifiable entities. Enhanced Know-Your-Customer (KYC) and Anti-Money Laundering (AML) protocols are critical for aligning blockchain practices with traditional financial regulations (4).

Global harmonization: International cooperation is essential to prevent regulatory arbitrage. The U.S. could leverage frameworks like the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with foreign regulators to synchronize cross-border enforcement and standardize digital asset regulations (41).

6.3 Ethical dimensions

Emerging technologies challenge the core regulatory principles of fairness and transparency, demanding a balance between innovation and ethical oversight.

Transparency vs. privacy: Blockchain's transparency conflicts with privacy when sensitive transactional data is publicly recorded. Regulators must establish clear parameters for which data is essential for oversight while employing privacy-preserving methods like anonymization or zero-knowledge proofs to safeguard individual rights (41).

AI and fairness: AI-driven trading systems often operate as "black boxes," raising ethical concerns about their accountability and fairness in market practices. Regulators must ensure that AI systems undergo interpretability audits and adhere to ethical guidelines, reducing information asymmetries and ensuring market parity (41).

Future-proofing ethical guidelines: Policymakers must anticipate future risks by establishing adaptable ethical frameworks that evolve alongside technological advancements. For instance, as smart contracts automate agreements, ethical oversight should ensure that these programs cannot be exploited for manipulative trades triggered by insider knowledge (41).

7. Enhancing Regulatory Practices

7.1. Enforcement agencies' roles

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) is the cornerstone of U.S. financial market regulation, enforcing laws that uphold fairness and integrity. Created under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the SEC wields investigative and enforcement powers to combat fraudulent trading practices, including insider trading (42).

The advent of complex financial instruments, such as derivatives, and the rise of high-frequency trading (HFT) have expanded the SEC's responsibilities (43). These advancements amplify challenges in monitoring trading practices due to the velocity and volume of transactions (44).

Technological evolution, including blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI), necessitates the adoption of robust surveillance frameworks. These technologies offer enhanced oversight opportunities but pose significant regulatory challenges, particularly in analyzing vast datasets and identifying sophisticated manipulation schemes (44).

To meet these demands, the SEC employs advanced technologies such as AI to detect irregular trading patterns and improve the efficiency of enforcement actions. These data-driven approaches enhance the SEC’s ability to uncover market manipulation and insider trading more effectively than traditional methods (44). However, these tools require continuous refinement to keep pace with emerging technologies.

7.2. Innovative surveillance technologies

AI and machine learning (ML) represent transformative tools in regulatory oversight, enabling the real-time analysis of extensive trading datasets. These technologies are instrumental in identifying anomalous patterns indicative of insider trading or market manipulation, significantly enhancing surveillance capabilities (44).

However, challenges persist. Biases embedded in AI training datasets can produce false positives or overlook fraudulent activity, complicating regulatory efforts (38). Furthermore, the opaque nature of AI algorithms, often referred to as the "black box," raises concerns about accountability and interpretability for regulators (38).

Blockchain technology provides immutable, time-stamped records, offering unparalleled transparency in transaction tracking (38). Nevertheless, its decentralized and pseudonymous nature conflicts with centralized regulatory structures and creates privacy concerns, especially when balancing transparency with data protection requirements (38).

To maximize blockchain’s regulatory utility, hybrid systems that combine blockchain’s transparency with centralized oversight can address these challenges. Such systems could enforce compliance with data protection laws while ensuring interoperability between decentralized and traditional financial infrastructures (38).

7.3. Global regulatory cooperation

The globalized nature of financial markets demands coordinated regulatory efforts to address cross-border insider trading and market manipulation. Jurisdictional discrepancies often allow regulatory arbitrage, where bad actors exploit gaps between national frameworks (38).

ISSN: **3075-2868** Website: www.jngr5.com Email: editor@jngr5.com

Comprehensive international frameworks are essential for harmonizing enforcement strategies and ensuring consistent application of laws across borders (38). These frameworks must include mechanisms for data sharing and joint investigations, enabling faster and more effective responses to transnational financial crimes (38).

Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) and bilateral agreements between the SEC and international counterparts, such as the European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA), are critical for cooperation. The International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) further strengthens global regulatory collaboration by standardizing practices and fostering mutual recognition agreements (38).

Notably, the SEC's partnerships with over 80 jurisdictions under IOSCO's Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MMOU) exemplify the effectiveness of international collaboration. These agreements allow regulators to share information seamlessly, address cross-border challenges, and enhance the overall integrity of global financial markets (43) (45).

By leveraging such collaborative frameworks and adopting advanced technological tools, regulators can address the evolving challenges posed by digital innovation, ensuring fair and transparent markets in an increasingly interconnected financial landscape.

Conclusion

The rapid advancements in technological innovations, particularly artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and machine learning, are redefining the landscape of global financial markets. These tools have introduced groundbreaking surveillance capabilities, improving the speed and precision of market oversight. However, these innovations also pose significant challenges to regulatory frameworks by complicating transparency, accountability, and oversight mechanisms. Addressing these challenges requires a proactive and adaptive regulatory approach.

The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 has provided a foundational legal framework for insider trading regulation, shaping enforcement and guiding key cases from 1966 to 2023. Nevertheless, this framework struggles to accommodate the intricacies and speed of modern digital financial practices, including algorithmic trading and decentralized technologies. Its limitations highlight the critical need for updates to address these transformative changes.

The globalization of financial markets further exacerbates these challenges. Cross-border market activities increase the risk of regulatory arbitrage, creating opportunities for market abuses in jurisdictions with weaker enforcement mechanisms. Therefore, enhanced international regulatory cooperation is essential. Harmonized standards and frameworks—such as those developed by the International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) and the Multilateral Memorandum of Understanding (MMOU)—ensure effective, coordinated enforcement across jurisdictions.

To combat these evolving threats, regulatory bodies must leverage advanced technological tools, including AI-driven anomaly detection systems and blockchain analytics. These technologies enable real-time market surveillance and detection of complex manipulative practices.

Simultaneously, transparency requirements for algorithmic trading systems and data-sharing agreements between international regulators must be strengthened to close enforcement gaps. Moreover, regulatory frameworks must evolve to encompass digital currencies, decentralized financial platforms, and smart contracts. Such evolution will require legislative changes and the integration of ethical considerations to ensure fairness and equity in the application of new technologies. Balancing the promotion of innovation with robust oversight mechanisms is essential to maintain market integrity.

In conclusion, the regulatory landscape must adapt to the dynamic realities of modern financial markets. By embracing technological tools, fostering international collaboration, and refining legal frameworks, policymakers can mitigate the risks posed by emerging technologies while leveraging their transformative potential. This balance will be critical for preserving trust, fairness, and stability in global financial markets in the digital era.

References

1. Prakash S. Our dysfunctional insider trading regime. Colum L Rev. 1999;99:1491.
2. Rane N, Choudhary S, Rane J. Blockchain and artificial intelligence (AI) integration for revolutionizing security and transparency in finance [Preprint]. SSRN. 2023.
3. Zachariadis M, Hileman G, Scott S V. Governance and control in distributed ledgers: Understanding the challenges facing blockchain technology in financial services. Inf Organ. 2019;29(2):105–17.
4. Fletcher GGS, Le MM. The future of ai accountability in the financial markets. Vand J Ent Tech L. 2021;24:289.
5. Leahy E. AI-powered bitcoin trading: developing an investment strategy with artificial intelligence. John Wiley & Sons; 2024.
6. Bainbridge SM. An overview of insider trading law and policy: an introduction to the insider trading research handbook. In: Bainbridge SM, editor. Research handbook on insider trading. Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar Publishing; 2013. p. 12–5.
7. Nicolaidis K, Shaffer G. Transnational mutual recognition regimes: governance without global government. Law Contemp Probl. 2004;68:263.
8. Zetzsche DA, Anker-Sørensen L, Passador ML, Wehrli A. DLT-based enhancement of cross-border payment efficiency: a legal and regulatory perspective. Law Financ Mark Rev. 2021;15(1–2):70–115.
9. Tracy JE, MacChesney AB. The Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Mich Law Rev. 1934;32(8):1025.
10. Williams JW. The private eyes of corporate culture: the forensic accounting and corporate investigation industry and the production of corporate financial security. In: Gill M, editor. Corporate security in the 21st century: theory and practice in international perspective. Cham (CH): Springer; 2014. p. 56–77.
11. Jain PK, Kim J, Rezaee Z. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and market liquidity. Financ Rev. 2008;43(3):361–82.

12. Prentice RA, Donelson DC. Insider trading as a signaling device. Am Bus LJ. 2010;47:1.
13. Securities and Exchange Commission. Whistleblower program [Internet]. Washington (DC): SEC; 2020 [cited 2025 Mar 25]. Available from: https://www.sec.gov/whistleblower
14. Act DF. Business law—Second Circuit extends the Dodd-Frank Act's anti-retaliation protection to internal whistleblowers—Berman v. Neo@Ogilvy LLC, 801 F.3d 145 (2d Cir. 2015). Suffolk Univ Law Rev. 2016;49:521.
15. Barr MS. Review of the Federal Reserve's supervision and regulation of Silicon Valley Bank. Board Governors Fed Reserv Syst. 2023;28(1).
16. Bamberger KA. Technologies of compliance: risk and regulation in a digital age. Tex L Rev. 2009;88:669.
17. Rabinowitz R. From securities to cybersecurity: the SEC zeroes in on cybersecurity. BCL Rev. 2020;61:1535.
18. Hacker P, Thomale C. Crypto-securities regulation: ICOs, token sales and cryptocurrencies under EU financial law. Eur Co Financ Law Rev. 2018;15(4):645–96.
19. Dooley MP. Enforcement of insider trading restrictions. Va L Rev. 1980;66:1.
20. Fenwick M, Vermeulen EPM. Technology and corporate governance: blockchain, crypto, and artificial intelligence. Tex J Bus L. 2019;48:1.
21. Hendershott T, Jones CM, Menkveld AJ. Does algorithmic trading improve liquidity? J Finance. 2011;66(1):1–33.
22. Mik E. Smart contracts: terminology, technical limitations and real-world complexity. Law Innov Technol. 2017;9(2):269–300.
23. Arnoldi J. Computer algorithms, market manipulation and the institutionalization of high-frequency trading. Theory Cult Soc. 2016;33(1):29–52.
24. Egli Costi M. Between shifts and continuum in cooperation: the international securities regulatory regime and its gradual evolution. In: Netherlands Yearbook of International Law 2017: Shifting Forms and Levels of Cooperation in International Economic Law. The Hague (NL): T.M.C. Asser Press; 2018. p. 327–77.
25. Collins PS. Regulation of securities, markets, and transactions: a guide to the new environment. Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley & Sons; 2011.
26. Appelbaum D, Cohen E, Kinory E, Stein Smith S. Impediments to blockchain adoption. J Emerg Technol Account. 2022;19(2):199–210.
27. Kellerman M. Market structure and disempowering regulatory intermediaries: insights from US trade surveillance. Regul Gov. 2021;15(4):1350–69.
28. Brigagliano J, Campion K, Katz D, Blake A. SEC adopts consolidated audit trail. J Invest Compliance. 2012;13(4):18–24.
29. Foley MT, Angstadt JM, Pazzol R, Van De Graaff JD. FINRA rule amendment requires registration of associated persons who develop algorithmic trading strategies. J Invest Compliance. 2016;17(3):39–41.
30. Lianos I, Hacker P, Eich S, Dimitropoulos G. Regulating blockchain: techno-social and legal challenges. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press; 2019.

31. Damgård I, Ganesh C, Khoshakhlagh H, Orlandi C, Siniscalchi L. Balancing privacy and accountability in blockchain identity management. In: Cryptographers' track at the RSA Conference. Cham (CH): Springer; 2021. p. 552–76.
32. David I, Zhou L, Qin K, Song D, Cavallaro L, Gervais A. Do you still need a manual smart contract audit? arXiv Prepr arXiv:2306.12338. 2023.
33. Allen DWE, Berg C, Markey-Towler B, Novak M, Potts J. Blockchain and the evolution of institutional technologies: implications for innovation policy. Res Policy. 2020;49(1):103865.
34. Sulkowski A. Blockchain, business supply chains, sustainability, and law: the future of governance, legal frameworks, and lawyers. Del J Corp L. 2018;43:303.
35. Kimani D, Adams K, Attah-Boakye R, Ullah S, Frecknall-Hughes J, Kim J. Blockchain, business and the fourth industrial revolution: whence, whither, wherefore and how? Technol Forecast Soc Change. 2020;161:120254.
36. Test J, Broker M. Machine learning for algorithm trading: master as a pro – applied artificial intelligence and Python for predicting systematic strategies for options and stocks. [Place unknown]: [Publisher unknown]; 2020.
37. Paul CS. The architecture of digital labour platforms: policy recommendations on platform design for worker well-being. ILO Futur Work Res Pap Ser. 2018;3.
38. Wischmeyer T. Artificial intelligence and transparency: opening the black box. In: Wischmeyer T, Rademacher T, editors. Regulating artificial intelligence. Cham (CH): Springer; 2020. p. 75–101.
39. Ali A, Rahouti M, Latif S, Kanhere S, Singh J, Janjua U, et al. Blockchain and the future of the internet: a comprehensive review. arXiv Prepr arXiv:1904.00733. 2019.
40. Weinberg AI, Faccia A. Quantum algorithms: a new frontier in financial crime prevention. arXiv Prepr arXiv:2403.18322. 2024.
41. Papantoniou AA. Regtech: steering the regulatory spaceship in the right direction? J Bank Financ Technol. 2022;6(1):1–16.
42. Grochowski M, Jablonowska A, Lagioia F, Sartor G. Algorithmic transparency and explainability for EU consumer protection: unwrapping the regulatory premises. Crit Anal L. 2021;8:43.
43. Allen HJ. The SEC as financial stability regulator. J Corp L. 2017;43:715.
44. Narang RK. Inside the black box: a simple guide to quantitative and high-frequency trading [Internet]. Vol. 846. Hoboken (NJ): John Wiley & Sons; 2013 [cited 2025 Mar 25]. Available from: https://books.google.co.ma/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=5T2HuSo-hLcC
45. Scott J. Extraterritoriality and territorial extension in EU law. Am J Comp Law. 2014;62(1):87–126.