

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

12. Can the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information for the investigation be kept confidential?

China

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

At the level of criminal procedure in PRC, only the Criminal Procedure Law of PRC provides that pseudonyms may be used in the indictment as a substitute for the disclosure of a witness's personal information, such as name, address, employer and contact information, to protect the personal safety of the witness. However, there are no relevant provisions on whether the identity of the complainant, the witness in civil litigation and the provider of information shall be kept confidential during an investigation.

During the course of an investigation, in order to protect the privacy of relevant personnel and avoid the risk of infringement, the employer usually keeps the identity of the complainant or the provider of investigation information confidential. However, at the civil litigation stage, the witness is unavoidably required to testify in court, and must truthfully identify himself/herself to the court.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

Spain

Author: *Sergio Ponce, Daniel Cerrutti*
at Uría Menéndez

As in question 10, the identity of the complainant or other employees involved in the investigation may be kept confidential and companies do not have to share their identity with investigated employees. Anonymous complaints are expressly allowed under Spanish law (see question 9).

Companies may have to produce this information and share it with the investigated employees if it is necessary to allow them to defend themselves from disciplinary measures taken against them. Similarly, in the context of litigation, an employee or plaintiff could request a Labour Court to order the company to disclose the details of the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

As mentioned under Question 10, the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) also entails the employer's duty to respect and protect the personality (including confidentiality and privacy) and integrity of employees (article 328 paragraph 1, Swiss Code of Obligations) and to take appropriate measures to protect them.

However, in combination with the right to be heard and the right to be informed regarding an investigation, the accused also has the right that incriminating evidence is presented to them throughout the investigation and that they can comment on it. For instance, this right includes disclosure of the persons accusing them and their concrete statements. Anonymisation or redaction of such statements is permissible if the interests of the persons incriminating the accused or the interests of the employer override the accused' interests to be presented with the relevant documents or statements (see question 11; see also article 9 paragraphs 1 and 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). However, a careful assessment of interests is required, and these must be limited to what is necessary. In principle, a person accusing another person must take responsibility for their information and accept criticism from the person implicated by the information provided.^[1]

[1] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 390.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



China

Leo Yu
Yvonne Gao
Tracy Liu
Larry Lian
Jingtian & Gongcheng



Spain

Sergio Ponce
Daniel Cerrutti
Uría Menéndez



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

