

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

Phil Linnard at Slaughter and May

Clare Fletcher at Slaughter and May

08. Can the employer search employees' possessions or files as part of an investigation?



Author: *Giovanni Muzina, Arianna Colombo*
at BonelliErede

In light of the legal and case-law principles as outlined above:

- see question 7 regarding employee “physical inspections and inspections on the employee’s belongings”;
- regarding “audiovisual equipment and other instruments from which the possibility of remote control of employees’ activities also arises”, article 4 of the Workers’ Statute provides for:
 - the prohibition of the use of audiovisual equipment and instruments of “direct” remote control (ie, whose sole purpose is to verify the manner, quality and quantity of working performance (eg, a camera installed in an office to film employees’ working activities, without any other purpose));
 - the possibility of carrying out controls through audiovisual equipment and “indirect” remote instruments (ie, instruments that serve different needs (organisational, production, work safety or company assets’ protection), but which indirectly monitor working activities (eg, a camera installed in a warehouse to prevent theft, but which indirectly monitors the activity of warehouse workers), which may only be installed with a trade union agreement (or National Labour Inspectorate authorisation);
 - the possibility of carrying out checks using working tools in the employee’s possession (e.g., PCs, tablets, mobile phones, e-mail), which may be carried out even in the absence of any trade union agreement, provided that the employee is given adequate information on how to use the tools and how checks may be carried out on their use (according to privacy law strictly related to the employment relationship).

Furthermore, based on case law, the employer can carry out so-called defensive controls (ie, actions carried out in the absence of the guarantees provided for in article 4, to protect the company and its assets from any unlawful conduct by employees). These “defensive controls” can be carried out if:

- they are intended to determine unlawful behaviour by the employee (ie, not simply to verify his or her working performance);
- there is a “well-founded suspicion” that an offence has been committed;
- they take place after the conduct complained of has been committed; and
- adequate precautions are nevertheless put in place to guarantee a proper balancing between the need to protect company assets and safeguarding the dignity and privacy of the employee.

Switzerland

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

The basic rule is that the employer may not search private data during internal investigations.

If there is a strong suspicion of criminal conduct on the part of the employee and a sufficiently strong justification exists, a search of private data may be justified.^[1] The factual connection with the employment relationship is given, for example, in the case of a criminal act committed during working hours or using workplace infrastructure.^[2]

^[1] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 168.

^[2] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 168 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

21. How do you handle a parallel criminal and/or regulatory investigation?

Italy

Author: *Giovanni Muzina, Arianna Colombo*
at BonelliErede

Generally speaking, internal investigations and those performed by external authorities are autonomous.

In addition, there are no general rules under which the employer must wait for the completion of a criminal investigation before completing its investigation and taking disciplinary action; if the employer believes it has sufficient grounds and evidence to take disciplinary action, it does not have to wait.

That being said, criminal investigations – given the wider investigation powers that public prosecutors or regulators have – may help to gather further evidence on the matter. From a practical point of view, the employer may decide to suspend (with pay) the employee pending the outcome of the criminal investigation, although this option must be evaluated carefully, given the potentially long duration of criminal proceedings, and the fact that the employer normally would not be in a position to access the documents and information about the criminal investigation (unless the company is somehow involved in the proceeding).

Lastly, in very general terms, police or public prosecutors have broad investigatory powers during criminal investigations, which could in certain circumstances make it compulsory for an employer to share evidence (but a case-by-case analysis is necessary regarding specific situations). Moreover, public prosecutors usually do not appreciate that, pending criminal proceedings, internal investigations are being conducted, because it can interfere with the criminal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

The actions of the employer may carry through to a subsequent state proceeding. First and foremost, any prohibitions on the use of evidence must be considered. Whereas in civil proceedings the interest in establishing the truth must merely prevail for exploitation (article 152 paragraph 2, Swiss Civil Procedure Code), in criminal proceedings, depending on the nature of the unlawful act, there is a risk that the evidence may not be used (see question 27 and article 140 et seq, Swiss Civil Procedure Code).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors

Italy

Giovanni Muzina
Arianna Colombo
BonelliErede

Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com