

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

01. What legislation, guidance and/or policies govern a workplace investigation?



Spain

Author: Sergio Ponce, Daniel Cerrutti at Uría Menéndez

Spain has not passed any statutes, regulations or policies specifically governing workplace investigations. Instead, general employment and data protection legislation, which safeguards employees' rights, is fully applicable during these types of enquiries.

These statutes focus on employee privacy. As a result, the application of this legislation:

- limits the matters that may be investigated: they have to be relevant to the employment relationship and there has to be a legitimate reason to conduct the enquiry;
- sets boundaries to the means that may be lawfully used by the company in the investigation: they must be the least intrusive means for employees' rights (for instance, an email review should be a last resort, reserved for when less-invasive means are not available or would not be effective); and
- states that the companies' decisions during the investigation must be proportional in light of the facts under review and the legal consequences attached to them.

Collective bargaining agreements, which in Spain generally apply to every company within their scope of application (normally a given economic sector), may regulate workplace investigations. However, it is unusual for collective bargaining agreements to regulate workplace investigations.

Finally, major international corporations with a presence in Spain do tend to have an ethics or whistleblowing policy that governs how an investigation should be conducted. Even if these are self-imposed policies, they are contractually binding and, once established, must be respected by companies.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner

at Bär & Karrer

There is no specific legal regulation for internal investigations in Switzerland. The legal framework is

derived from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights. Depending on the context of the investigation, additional legal provisions may apply; for instance, additional provisions of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection or the Swiss Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

26. How long should the outcome of the investigation remain on the employee's record?



Spain

Author: Sergio Ponce, Daniel Cerrutti at Uría Menéndez

The outcome of the investigation will contain personal data of the affected employee. For this reason, this information should only be kept for as long as a legal obligation or liability in connection with the information could arise for the company. Since the general statute of limitations for employment liability is one year, this is a good guideline.

In addition to the above, two specific rules apply:

- once the information becomes irrelevant for the purpose for which it was obtained and processed, the information should no longer be stored on the employee's record or elsewhere; and
- the employees' information (including those of the reporter and the affected employees) should only be stored in whistleblower systems during the time that is necessary to decide on whether the facts need to be investigated or not and, in any case, for a maximum period of three months.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner at Bär & Karrer

From an employment law point of view, there is no statute of limitations on the employee's violations. Based on the specific circumstances (eg, damage incurred, type of violation, basis of trust or the position of the employee), a decision must be made as to the extent to which the outcome should remain on the record.

From a data protection point of view, only data that is in the interest of the employee (eg, to issue a reference letter) may be retained during the employment relationship. In principle, stored data must be deleted after the termination of the employment relationship. Longer retention may be justified if rights are still to be safeguarded or obligations are to be fulfilled in the future (eg, data needed regarding foreseeable legal proceedings, data required to issue a reference letter or data in relation to a non-competition clause).[1]

[1] Wolfgang Portmann/Isabelle Wildhaber, Schweizerisches Arbeitsrecht, 4. Edition, Zurich/St. Gallen 2020, N 473.

Contributors



Spain

Sergio Ponce Daniel Cerrutti Uría Menéndez



Switzerland

Laura Widmer Sandra Schaffner Bär & Karrer

www. international employment lawyer. com