

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

Phil Linnard at Slaughter and May
Clare Fletcher at Slaughter and May

25. Who can (or must) the investigation findings be disclosed to? Does that include regulators/police? Can the interview records be kept private, or are they at risk of disclosure?

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

If the relevant investigation authorities or regulatory authorities require the employer to provide the investigation findings and the interview records of its employee's illegal activities, the employer is usually obliged to cooperate with the authorities and make disclosures according to the requirements of the law. Meanwhile, according to Article 110 of the Criminal Procedure Law of the PRC, any entity or individual who has found out facts of a crime or a criminal suspect has both the right and the duty to report the case or provide information to the public security authority, the people's procuratorate or the people's court. Therefore, if the investigation findings show that the employee is suspected of a crime, the employer should disclose the information to the relevant investigation authorities including the public security authority. For some special industries, for example, the investigation findings against the banking industry usually also need to be reported to the higher-level banking supervisory authorities. Although the relevant investigation staff and supervisory staff are usually required to comply with the confidentiality obligations according to the laws or regulations, the risk of leakage of the reported information due to the expansion of the scope of persons who are aware of the investigation findings cannot be completely excluded.

In addition, an employer may decide whether to disclose the results of an investigation (mainly including the violation of disciplines and the disciplinary punishment) to other employees at its own discretion, but has to disclose the relevant information among employees to the extent that it is "minimum and necessary", so as to avoid infringing on the employee's personal information or privacy or even right of reputation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

Italy

Author: *Giovanni Muzina, Arianna Colombo*
at BonelliErede

Generally speaking, even if the investigation leads to evidence of a criminal offence, the employer does not have to inform public authorities (citizens and private entities do not have an obligation to report crimes they discover). The existence of any obligations to report to regulatory authorities (eg, banking and insurance regulatory authorities) should be investigated on a case-by-case basis.

The internal procedures of the company – as adopted by the company in the framework of legislation on the administrative or quasi-criminal vicarious liability of legal entities – may require the findings to be disclosed to certain internal bodies or committees.

As said above, the police or public prosecutors (and possibly other public authorities) may have, within their investigatory powers, and in certain circumstances, the power to access internal investigation outcomes (but a case-by-case analysis would be necessary).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The employer is generally not required to disclose the final report, or the data obtained in connection with the investigation. In particular, the employer is not obliged to file a criminal complaint with the police or the public prosecutor's office.

Exceptions may arise, for example, from data protection law (see question 22) or a duty to release records may arise in a subsequent state proceeding.

Data voluntarily submitted in a proceeding in connection with the internal investigation shall be considered private opinion or party assertion.^[1] If the company refuses to hand over the documents upon request, coercive measures may be used under certain circumstances.^[2]

[1] Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio Romerio/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), *Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen*, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 123.

[2] Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio Romerio/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), *Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen*, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 102 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors

China

Leo Yu
Yvonne Gao
Tracy Liu
Larry Lian
Jingtian & Gongcheng

Italy

Giovanni Muzina
Arianna Colombo
BonelliErede



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com