World Bulletin of Management and Law (WBML)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Volume-49, August-2025
ISSN: 2749-3601

TRADE SECRET PROTECTION VERSUS EMPLOYEE MOBILITY

Ma'mura Turg'unboyeva
Researcher at Tashkent International Westminster University
mturgunboyeva@wiut.uz

Article history:

Received: 20th June 2025
Accepted: 14th July 2025

Abstract:

Trade secret protection and labor mobility often converge, causing employers, workers, and policymakers legal and management conundrums. Here, the author examines the statutory law governing trade secrets, the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA) and the Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA), and how courts balance protection of confidential business information against the right of workers to change employers and use general skill sets. It discusses enforceability of restrictive covenants, standards of evidence for misappropriation claims, and remedies to claimants. The article focuses on compliance strategies effective for employers in practice, best practices during workforce transitions, and policy issues to find a balance for innovation incentives and labor market competition. It makes suggestions to reduce litigation risk while preserving valid interests of both parties.

Keywords: trade secrets, employee mobility, non-compete agreements, non-disclosure agreements.

INTRODUCTION

Trade secrets are a core form of intellectual property that protect commercially valuable, confidential information such as formulas, methods, customer lists, and business methods. Contrary to copyrights or patents, trade secrets depend on good faith and secrecy efforts to preserve such information as confidential rather than registration. In today's information-based economies, businesses depend heavily on know-how that employees gain to stay competitive, whereas employees want career advancement and freedom to use their skills across the labor market. There is tension when employers rely upon contractual limits or assert trade secret protection to limit employee mobility. Judges and legislatures must balance protecting legitimate business interests against preventing unreasonable restraints on commerce and the free flow of labor [1].

This article provides a short overview of the statutory requirements of protection of a trade secret, typical contractual mechanisms employers use to protect confidential information, and prevalent doctrines used by courts to evaluate cases—i.e., a definition of a trade secret, reasonable measures to maintain it as a secret, and misappropriation. It also addresses the enforceability and function of non-disclosure and non-compete contracts between jurisdictions, equitable and statutory remedies, and evidentiary burdens in lawsuits. The article ends with pragmatic recommendations for employees and employers to minimize conflict, as well as policy insights for reform efforts that seek to balance protection and mobility [2].

MAIN PART

Trade secrets are protected when information acquires independent economic value by not being in the general know-how and where there are efforts to maintain it as a secret. The principal statutes in the United States are state enactments of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA) and the federal Defend Trade Secrets Act (DTSA), which provide civil relief for misappropriation. Judges apply fact-specific methods to determine if a piece of information is a trade secret, examining its secrecy, economic value, and steps taken by the owner to preserve it. Misappropriation tends to require proof of wrongful acquisition, disclosure, or use—e.g., theft, breach of confidence, or inducement of breach.

Employers commonly employ non-disclosure agreements (NDAs), non-compete covenants, and non-solicitation clauses to protect confidential information. NDAs are commonly employed when they closely protect secret information and are linked to sensible time and scope. Non-competes, however, are facing increasing judicial and legislative disapproval due to their potential to unfairly restrict employee mobility and suppress wages. Enforceability of non-competes is generally limited in most states unless they are reasonable in terms of geography, length, and scope, and linked to valid business interests. Non-solicitation clauses prohibiting poaching of employees or customers are more likely to be effective if specifically worded and temporary [3].

The employees also retain the right to apply general skills, expertise, and publicly available knowledge. Courts differentiate between the confidential trade secrets of an employee and their implied know-how or

World Bulletin of Management and Law (WBML)
Available Online at: https://www.scholarexpress.net
Volume-49, August-2025
ISSN: 2749-3601

"general skillset." When the employee moves to a rival company, legitimate competition is permitted provided it does not rely on stolen secrets. Employers cannot claim proprietary rights over common professional knowledge or keep employees unemployed; otherwise, it would stifle fluidity in the labor market and innovation. Employees should, however, be cautious about carrying or memorizing secret papers or code and must meet exit conditions to avoid allegations of misappropriation [4].

Trade secret cases usually hinge on documentary and forensic proof—access logs, email history, file copies on personal computers, and metadata. Courts may order preliminary remedies such as temporary restraining orders or seizure under the DTSA where there is an established risk of imminent disclosure. The plaintiff must establish likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, and balance of equities for injunctive relief. Defendants can challenge the existence of secrecy, the adequacy of protective measures, or prove independent development. Because of expense and uncertainty, most are resolved, at times on a limited-defined injunction or monetary payment [5].

To reduce litigation risk yet safeguard assets rightfully, employers must have layered safeguards: rank sensitive data, limit access need-to-know, use technical controls (encryption, access controls, DLP), and conduct regular audits. Contracts need to be tightly drawn, with good definitions of confidential information, sensible time and space limitations, and clear post-employment responsibilities. Comprehensive onboarding and offboarding processes—exit interviews, reminders of responsibility, and checkpoints for return of devices—record reasonable efforts at secrecy and support a company's case in court.

Staff must make sure they review employment contracts carefully, clarify what is to be regarded as confidential, and not take proprietary documents or code on departure. Having documentation of independent work product and chronology of development will combat misappropriation allegations. Where possible, negotiate reasonable restrictions on hiring or before signing restrictive covenants; demand garden leave, pay during restrictive periods, or narrower non-competition definitions. In times of doubt, consult before taking a new job that could entail former employer secrets.

Policymakers face a challenging trade-off: overbroad protections could chill competition and mobility of labor, while weak protections will ruin incentives to invest in innovation. More recent reforms tilt toward restraining non-competes, enhancing transparency on what constitutes illegal misappropriation, and promoting alternatives like targeted non-solicitation, garden leave, or enhanced criminal sanctions for egregious theft. Optimal policy adjusts enforceability to the nature of information—strict control over few, very valuable secrets and lax constraint on widespread skills—and brings out open employer practice making transparent what the employees can anticipate. This balance supports both firm-level innovation and a competitive and dynamic labor market.

CONCLUSION

Balancing protection for trade secrets and employee mobility is a delicate balance between the respective interests in maintaining confidential business information confidential and in enjoying an open labor market from an economic and social perspective. The legal frameworks like the UTSA and DTSA provide a framework for the fight against misappropriation, yet cases often turn upon fact-specific questions regarding measures of secrecy, the nature of the information, and reasonableness of restraints in contracts. Employers can reduce the risk of disputes by taking targeted confidentiality practices, narrowly defined agreements, and high-quality onboarding and offboarding. The workers need to be made aware of contractual conditions and preserve their ability to utilize general skills and publicly known facts. Policymakers need to provide clear rules that discourage wrongful appropriation without overly limiting the mobility of laborers, like limiting overbroad non-competes and promoting alternative safeguarding tools like garden leave or narrowly restricted covenants. Balancing all these interests will assist in maintaining competition, innovation, and equal employment practices.

REFERENCES

1. Godfrey, E. R. (2004). Inevitable disclosure of trade secrets: Employee mobility v. employer's rights. J. High Tech. L., 3, 161.
2. Feldman, M. J. (1994). Toward a Clearer Standard of Protectable Information: Trade Secrets and the Employment Relationship. High Tech. LJ, 9, 151.
3. Png, I. P., & Samila, S. (2015). Trade secrets law and mobility: Evidence from'Inevitable Disclosure'. Available at SSRN 1986775.
4. Reder, M. E., & O'Brien, C. N. (2011). Managing the risk of trade secret loss due to job mobility in an innovation economy with the theory of inevitable disclosure. J. High Tech. L., 12, 373.
5. Newman, B. K. (2007). Protecting Trade Secrets: Dealing with the Brave New World of Employee Mobility. Bus. L. Today, 17, 25.