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?

Hong Kong

Author: Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li at Slaughter and May

As mentioned in questions 21, 22 and 23, under Hong Kong law, the employer is generally not obliged to actively disclose the findings of a workplace investigation to any party.

Having said that, the employer should be aware of certain statutory disclosure requirements that may become applicable as a result of the matters revealed during the workplace investigation. For example, if the investigation reveals or gives rise to any knowledge or suspicion that any property represents the proceeds of an indictable offence[1], drug trafficking[2], or terrorism[3], the employer is required to report its knowledge or suspicion, together with any matter on which that knowledge or suspicion is based, to the JFIU as soon as is reasonably practicable (even where the investigation has not yet been concluded). Employers who are licensed corporations must also provide the SFC with information about whether departing licensed employees were the subject of an internal investigation in the six months prior to his/her departure. If the internal investigation commences after the departure of the licensed employee, the licensed corporation should notify the SFC as soon as practicable[4].

In any event, as in question 14, if any documents related to the investigation are protected by legal professional privilege, they can generally be kept confidential and would not be subject to disclosure even if the employer is subject to a mandatory reporting or disclosure obligation.

- [1] OSCO section 25A(1).
- [2] DTROPO section 25A(1).
- [3] UNATMO section 12(1).
- [4] Frequently Asked Questions on "Disclosure of investigations commenced by licensed corporations in the notifications of cessation of accreditation" issued by the SFC on 21 May 2019

corporations#627D0257CCA8410189F48C1A68443112>.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



Spain

Author: Sergio Ponce, Daniel Cerrutti at Uría Menéndez

Companies may only disclose the outcome of an investigation to employees or officers of the company who are empowered to adopt the measures that are necessary because of the investigation's results (see question 4).

This disclosure obligation does not extend to authorities: while there is a general obligation to report criminal or administrative offences to the competent authorities, this obligation must be read in line with the companies' right not to self-report themselves. What a company must not do is cover up, aid or otherwise become an accessory to the offence.

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



Hong Kong

Wynne Mok Jason Cheng Audrey Li Slaughter and May



Spain

Sergio Ponce Daniel Cerrutti Uría Menéndez



Switzerland

Laura Widmer Sandra Schaffner Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com