

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?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Austrian law does not impose an obligation on employers to conduct internal investigations and they do not have to follow a specific legal pattern when doing so. However, an obligation to conduct internal investigations may arise out of certain provisions of criminal, company or even labour law – in particular, an indirect obligation arising from an employer's duty of care, which requires them to act against employee mistreatment, such as bullying.

If such internal investigations are initiated, compliance with labour law and data protection regulations is mandatory. According to section 16 of the Austrian Civil Code (ABGB), the employer must also protect the personal rights of the individual. It is important to emphasise that a company's internal investigation is a private measure and differs from official investigations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

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

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The Labour Protection Act B.E. 2541 (1998) (LPA) is the key legislation governing the relationship between employer and employee in Thailand. The LPA set out a minimum standard for the protection of employees' rights, as well as a mechanism for suspension from work for an investigation.

The LPA requires any employer having ten or more employees to prepare work rules in the Thai language and the work rules require an employer to prescribe a procedure for the submission of grievances that would normally include the process for investigations in the workplace. Therefore, the work rules are the main guidance and policy that govern a workplace investigation. In some cases, an employer may have a whistleblowing policy allowing whistle-blowers to submit complaints of illegal or improper activities to the employer. The whistleblowing policy will also prescribe the procedures for investigating in workplace reflecting the complaints submitted by whistle-blowers.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

In the United States, any combination of legislation at the federal, state and local level, as well as judicial opinions and regulatory guidance interpreting those statutes, may impose obligations on relevant employers to undertake a timely internal investigation in response to complaints of workplace misconduct and to promptly implement remedial measures, where appropriate.

An employer's written policies often also set forth the company's expectations for how its employees, partners, vendors, consultants or other third parties will conduct themselves in carrying out the business of the company, and these policies may include protocols setting forth the parameters for an investigation in the event of potential non-compliance. Such investigatory roadmaps are often described in, for example, employee handbooks or a company's policy against discrimination and harassment.

Due to the patchwork nature of employment and related laws, it is not possible to cover every investigation scenario or related legislation in this guide. Employers should instead consult with experienced employment attorneys in their state to ensure compliance with the applicable legal and regulatory regimes.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, an internal investigation is only initiated if there is suspicion of a violation. The decision to commence an internal investigation is up to the company, and it has to weigh the pros and cons. For limited liability companies, which are subject to the Association Responsibility Act, an internal investigation may exempt them from criminal liability. Disadvantages may include investigation costs, disruption of

operations, discovery of information requiring later disclosure, possible negative media coverage and increased risk of exposure to external parties.

Investigations can relate to specific individuals, departments, or the entire company. An investigation may include various measures, such as obtaining and analysing files and documents, conducting questionnaires and employee interviews, monitoring internet use, video or telephone surveillance of employees and setting up whistleblowing hotlines. Not all measures are acceptable without restrictions. The provisions of labour law and data protection law must always be complied with.

To avoid wasting resources, the objectives of the investigation should be defined in advance. In addition, the selection and sequence of instruments to be used should be determined. A legal assessment of the chosen measures is essential to avoid legal complications.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

Internal investigations are usually initiated after reports about possible violations of the employer's code of conduct, applicable laws or regulations have been submitted by employees to their superiors, the human resources department or designated internal reporting systems such as hotlines (including whistleblowing hotlines).

For an internal investigation to be initiated, there must be a reasonable suspicion (grounds).^[1] If no such grounds exist, the employer must ask the informant for further or more specific information. If no grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the case must be closed. If grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the appropriate investigative steps can be initiated by a formal investigation request from the company management.^[2]

^[1] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 21.

^[2] Klaus Moosmayer, *Compliance, Praxisleitfaden für Unternehmen*, 2. A. München 2015, N 314.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Usually, a complainant submitting a grievance to the company would be a trigger for proceeding with a workplace investigation. The LPA does not specify when a workplace investigation should commence but it is subject to the employer's work rules and regulations, including the whistleblowing policy, as the investigation usually commences after an employee or a whistle-blower has filed a complaint to the employer. In some cases, there might be a whistleblower and the start of the workplace investigation would be subject to the whistleblowing policy and the employer's discretion. Also, if a questionable transaction or activity is detected, fiscal audits may be the source that triggers a voluntary workplace investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

A workplace investigation is often, although not always, prompted by a complaint of workplace misconduct, usually made directly by the employee who was harmed by the conduct, a third party who witnessed the conduct, or a manager or supervisor who was made aware of the issue and has reporting obligations as a result of his or her role in the organisation.

It is best practice – and often a legal requirement depending on the applicable state law – for companies to clearly outline a complaint process in their policies and to provide employees who experience, have knowledge of, or witness incidents they believe to violate the company’s policies with one or more options for making a report. Although the specific complaint procedure may vary depending on the size of the organisation, the nature of the business and the type of complaint at issue, many companies provide for (or require) making a report through one of the following channels:

- a company-managed hotline or online equivalent;
- human resources;
- an affected employee’s supervisor or manager; or
- a member of the legal or compliance department.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

03. Can an employee be suspended during a workplace investigation? Are there any conditions on suspension (eg, pay, duration)?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Yes. An employer may always, and without legal restrictions, temporarily suspend an employee during an internal investigation, provided he or she continues to be paid.

However, suspending the employee does not release the employer from an obligation to terminate employment without notice. It must be clear to the employee that the suspension is a temporary measure in preparation for dismissal. A suspension does not entitle the employer to postpone the reasons for dismissal for any length of time. The longer the suspension lasts, the more likely it is that the employer intends to keep the employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

It is possible to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation.^[1] While there are no limits on duration, the employee will remain entitled to full pay during this time.

[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 181.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

While an employee is being investigated by the employer, the LPA permits the employer to suspend that employee from work for the duration of the investigation, provided that the suspension can only be made when permitted by the work rules or an agreement related to the conditions of employment. Also, a suspension order must be made in writing and specify the offence and period of the suspension, which may not exceed seven days. Note that the employer must give a written suspension order in advance to the employee before the work suspension.

As aforementioned, the LPA only permits the employer to suspend the employee under investigation from work only for seven days. During the interim period of the suspension, the employer must pay the employee at the rate indicated in the work rules or the agreement reached between the employer and the employee, which must not be less than half of the employee's wages for a working day before his or her suspension. If the employer determines that the employee subject to investigation is not guilty following the outcome, the employer must compensate the employee for outstanding wages from the date of suspension with 15% interest per annum.

In some complicated cases, a workplace investigation does not conclude within seven days, and, in which case the employer should consult with a legal advisor.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Yes. An employer may suspend the subject of an internal investigation with full pay pending the outcome of an investigation. However, this measure should be used sparingly, for example in cases where an employee has been accused of gross misconduct or where it is the only means of separating the alleged victim of harassment from the accused to prevent continued harassment. As an alternative means of separating the victim from the accused, an employer can consider interim measures such as a schedule change, transfer or leave of absence for the alleged victim with his or her consent (employers should take care not to take any action that could be perceived as retaliatory against the complainant – even if well-intentioned – including involuntarily transferring him or her or forcing a leave of absence).

Where an employer does determine that suspending the subject of an investigation is warranted while the company carries out its investigation, it should provide him or her with a written statement briefly outlining the reason for the suspension and the estimated date the employee will be advised of the investigation outcome and his or her final employment status.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

04. Who should conduct a workplace investigation, are there minimum qualifications or criteria that need to be met?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

There are no prescribed minimum standards for this procedure. The responsibility for conducting these investigations lies with the employers. Internal compliance or legal teams are often entrusted with this task, as they are familiar with internal protocols. In practice, these investigations are often overseen by an internal team, occasionally with the assistance of law firms or auditing firms. Those involved in the investigation must remain impartial. Potentially biased persons, such as those under investigation and their close associates, should be excluded from participation.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

The examinations can be carried out internally by designated internal employees, by external specialists, or by a combination thereof. The addition of external advisors is particularly recommended if the allegations are against an employee of a high hierarchical level^[1], if the allegations concerned are quite substantive and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

^[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 18.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The employer should conduct a workplace investigation on its own; however, an outside firm experienced in interviewing witnesses and assessing the credibility of evidence may also be appointed to assist with the workplace investigation.

There is no minimum qualification or criteria provided under Thai laws. It is worth noting that anyone who has been accused of misconduct or potentially has a conflict of interest should be excluded from any role in the investigation. This is to avoid a challenge from the subject employee that the investigation was not conducted fairly.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

While every internal investigation should be carried out promptly, thoroughly and in a well-documented manner, employers should appoint one individual or team of individuals to oversee all complaints regardless of how they are received. Doing so helps to ensure that all allegations are documented, reviewed and assigned for investigation as consistently as practicable.

Once a complaint is received and recorded, the company should undertake an initial triage process to determine:

- the risk of the alleged misconduct from a reputational, operational and legal perspective;
- who is best suited to conduct an investigation based on the nature of the alleged misconduct and the perceived risk level (potential candidates may include members of human resources, legal or compliance departments, or outside counsel); and
- a plan for investigating the factual allegations raised in the complaint.

The appropriate investigator should be able to investigate objectively without bias (ie, the investigator cannot have a stake in the outcome, a personal relationship with the involved parties and the outcome of the investigation should not directly affect the investigator's position within the organisation); has skills that include prior investigative knowledge and a working knowledge of employment laws; has strong interpersonal skills to build a rapport with the parties involved and to be perceived as neutral and fair; is detail-oriented; has the right temperament to conduct interviews; can be trusted to maintain confidentiality; is respected within the organisation; and can act as a credible witness.

At this triage stage, an employer may also wish to use the information collected from the complaint to proactively identify potential patterns or systemic issues at an individual, divisional or corporate level and react accordingly. For example, if a company receives a complaint against a supervisor for harassing conduct and that same individual has already been the subject of previous complaints, the company should consider whether it may be appropriate to engage outside counsel to carry out a new investigation to bring objectivity and lend credibility to the review – even if the prior complaints were not ultimately substantiated following thorough internal investigations. Similarly, the engagement of outside counsel is often appropriate where a complaint involves alleged misconduct on the part of a company's senior management or board members.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

05. Can the employee under investigation bring legal action to stop the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If the investigated employee believes that individual measures violate his rights, he or she can defend him or herself against them, but he or she cannot stop the entire investigation.

In principle, the employee has various rights such as access, rectification, erasure and the right to contest the processing of his or her data (articles 12-17 and 21 GDPR). Should these principles be violated, the employee has the right to lodge a complaint with the data protection authority.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

The accused could theoretically request a court to stop the investigation, for instance, by arguing that there is no reason for the investigation and that the investigation infringes the employee's personality rights. However, if the employer can prove that there were grounds for reasonable suspicion and is conducting the investigation properly, it is unlikely that such a request would be successful.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

There is no mechanism in place to take legal action to halt an investigation. The investigation is an internal process of the employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

In general, private sector employees have considerably fewer rights vis-à-vis a company-led internal investigation than their public sector counterparts. This is because many US states are “at will” employment states, which means that, absent an employment contract that provides otherwise, an employee can be terminated for any reason not prohibited by statute or public policy. Depending on the specific circumstances, however, an employee who is the subject of an internal investigation could bring or threaten legal action according to contract or tort principles to stop an investigation. An employee may also challenge an investigation because it was conducted in violation of certain federal, state or foreign laws, for example, the use of polygraph tests in violation of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act or foreign data privacy laws.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

06. Can co-workers be compelled to act as witnesses? What legal protections do employees have when acting as witnesses in an investigation?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

An essential part of an internal investigation is the questioning of employees. Their statements contribute

significantly to clarifying possible violations. In particular, the legal principles that apply to criminal proceedings, including the right to refuse to testify, do not apply directly to internal investigations.

Employees do not legally have to participate in such interviews. Their duty to cooperate arises indirectly from other legal provisions, in particular from employees' duties of loyalty and service under labour law.

Austrian law suggests there is a general principle of loyalty, which triggers a "duty to inform" under some circumstances; in principle, the employee and any witnesses are expected to provide information in the context of internal investigations. While the employee is not compelled to incriminate him or herself, he or she also may not withhold work-related information that the employer legitimately wishes to protect, for the sole reason that it might incriminate him or her. The decision as to whether the employee must disclose information depends on a balancing of interests in the specific case.

Investigators and employers must strictly adhere to the permissible limits. This requires compliance with labour law, criminal law and data protection law.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

Due to the employee's duty of loyalty towards the employer and the employer's right to give instructions to its employees, employees generally must take part in an ongoing investigation and comply with any summons for questioning if the employer demands this (article 321d, Swiss Code of Obligations). If the employees refuse to participate, they generally are in breach of their statutory duties, which may lead to measures such as a termination of employment.

The question of whether employees may refuse to testify if they would have to incriminate themselves is disputed in legal doctrine.^[1] However, according to legal doctrine, a right to refuse to testify exists if criminal conduct regarding the questioned employee or a relative (article 168 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) is involved, and it cannot be ruled out that the investigation documentation may later end up with the prosecuting authorities (ie, where employees have a right to refuse to testify in criminal proceedings, they cannot be forced to incriminate themselves by answering questions in an internal investigation).^[2]

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on hrtoday.ch, last visited on 17 June 2022.

^[2] Same opinion: Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on hrtoday.ch, last visited on 17 June 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Normally, the work rules prescribe requirements for cooperation with investigations. An employer may instruct co-workers to give statements as witnesses as this would be a fair and legitimate order of the employer, because investigations are conducted to maintain a good working environment.

Witness protection measures in a workplace can vary as no minimum standard has been set and they are generally subject to work rules and regulations. However, some legislation, which may not relate to a workplace investigation conducted by an employer, also protects the witnesses who are helping authorities investigate violations under the relevant acts. For example, the Labor Relation Act B.E. 2518 (1975) prohibits an employer from terminating an employee or conducting any action that may result in the employee being unable to work because of filing a complaint or being a witness for the authorities, or providing information on issues related to labour protection laws to the authorities.

The employer may have a policy of non-retaliation for the protection of witnesses who have given statements and evidence for a workplace investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Yes. The investigator is empowered to decide which witnesses should be interviewed as a part of the fact-gathering process. In addition to interviewing the complainant, the investigation should include individual interviews with other involved parties, including the subject of the complaint, as well as individuals who may have observed the alleged conduct or may have other relevant knowledge, including supervisors or other employees. Many companies' code of conduct, employee handbook or similar policy set forth the requirement for current employees to cooperate fully in any investigation by the company or its external advisors and also provide that failure to do so could result in disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

In the absence of contractual protections, employees may have no legal right to refuse to submit to an interview, even if their answers tend to incriminate them. That being said, when acting as a witness in an internal investigation, a current employee is usually afforded similar legal protections as the subject of an investigation, including the right to oppose unreasonable intrusions into his or her privacy and unreasonable workplace searches. For example, certain state laws prohibit an employer from questioning an employee regarding issues that serve no business purpose.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

07. What data protection or other regulations apply when gathering physical evidence?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

All data processing must comply with the principles of article 5 GDPR (lawfulness, fairness, transparency, purpose limitation, data minimisation, accuracy, storage limitation and integrity). Personal data may only be collected and processed for specific, lawful purposes.

The admissibility of data processing depends on whether the suspicion relates to a criminal offence or another violation of the law. If the data processing is relevant to criminal law, article 10 GDPR or section 4(3) of the Austrian Data Protection Act (DSG) applies. If the investigations are exclusively to clarify violations under civil or labour law, such as an assertion of claims for damages or if they are general investigations to establish a criminal offence, the permissibility of data processing is based on article 6 or,

for data covered by article 9 GDPR, on this provision.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

The Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection applies to the gathering of evidence, in particular such collection must be lawful, transparent, reasonable and in good faith, and data security must be preserved.[\[1\]](#)

It can be derived from the duty to [disclose and hand over benefits received and work produced](#) (article 321b, Swiss Code of Obligations) as they belong to the employer.[\[2\]](#) The employer is, therefore, generally entitled to collect and process data connected with the end product of any work completely by an employee and associated with their business. However, it is prohibited by the Swiss Criminal Code to open a sealed document or consignment to gain knowledge of its contents without being authorised to do so (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code). Anyone who disseminates or makes use of information of which he or she has obtained knowledge by opening a sealed document or mailing not intended for him or her may become criminally liable (article 179 paragraph 1, Swiss Criminal Code).

It is advisable to state in internal regulations that the workplace might be searched as part of an internal investigation and in compliance with all applicable data protection rules if this is necessary as part of the investigation.

[\[1\]](#) Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen, in: Jusletter 18 February 2019, N 52.

[\[2\]](#) Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 148.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The basic premise is that all evidence is admissible unless it violates the law of admissibility and production of evidence, which may vary depending on the jurisdiction. In a criminal court, for example, evidence gathered in violation of the fruit of the poisonous tree doctrine would be typically inadmissible, yet in a civil court, this doctrine would not be an exclusionary rule.

The Personal Data Protection Act, BE 2562 (2019) (PDPA), which is the main data protection law in Thailand, applies when collecting, using, and disclosing pieces of evidence containing the personal data of employees. If the investigation requires sensitive information of the employee under investigation, for example, race, ethnic origin, political opinion, religious or philosophical beliefs, sexual behavior, criminal records, health data, disability, genetic data and biometric data, consent from the employee should be obtained.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Documents and instruments that set out a company's policies (eg, employee handbooks, code of conduct or other written guidelines) often contain provisions regarding employee data and document collection, workplace searches, communication monitoring, privacy, and confidentiality. As discussed below, state and federal constitutional, statutory and common law – and in some cases foreign data privacy regimes – may provide additional protections to protect employees from an unwarranted or unreasonable invasion of privacy during an internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, it is advisable to back up data, documents, emails and other records promptly to prevent their deletion. Admissibility depends on whether the data originates from personal or professional records and whether they are legally relevant. If internal investigations are carried out based on a specific suspicion of a criminal offence, it is the processing of legally relevant data. In general, the processing of professional emails or documents is permissible. If there is no professional connection, access to private files and documents is only permitted in exceptional cases.

If, for example, using a business email account for private purposes is not allowed, the employer can usually assume that the data processed is only "general" data within the meaning of article 6 GDPR and that such data processing is justified by a balancing of interests. However, if private use is allowed, the data may still be part of a special category within the meaning of article 9 GDPR. In such cases, the justification for its use must be based on one of the grounds explicitly mentioned in article 9(2) GDPR.

The employer must protect the employee's rights under section 16 of the ABGB and must consider the proportionality of the interference. Only the least restrictive means – the method that least interferes with the employee's rights – may be used to obtain the necessary information. The employer's interest in obtaining the information must outweigh the employee's interest in protecting his or her rights. The implementation or initiation of controls by the employer does not automatically constitute an interference with personal rights, as being subject to the employer's rights of control is part of the position as an employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

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



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Electronic information created during employment would generally be owned by the employer and would be the employer's assets. If an employee is given a computer or laptop to use for work, the employer has the right to log into that device and take any data that is stored therein, provided that the data does not contain sensitive information of that employee and PDPA requirements are met.

To avoid any potential issues regarding physical data such as documents on the employee's desk, it is advisable to search those areas with the subject employee to show good faith. In practice, the employee normally agrees to search those areas with the employer, or allows the employer to search alone.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

As there is no unified data protection regime, privacy protections stem from a patchwork of federal and state privacy laws which impose limits on the extent to which an employer can collect information from its employees in connection with an internal investigation. Whether specific conduct violates an employee's rights is a very fact-specific inquiry requiring the application of relevant state laws and a regulatory regime.

In most circumstances, an employer is free to conduct searches of its workplace and computer systems in the course of investigating potential wrongdoing. Such searches are generally not protected by personal privacy laws because workspaces, computer systems and company-issued electronic devices are often considered company property. Many companies explicitly address this in written corporate policies and employment agreements. Employees who use their own electronic devices for work should be aware that work-related data stored on those devices is generally considered to belong to the employer (as a matter of best practice, employers should generally prohibit or at least advise employees against using personal devices for work and to maintain separate work devices, where possible).

These broad investigatory powers notwithstanding, the ability of an employer to conduct searches in furtherance of an internal investigation is not unlimited. For example, if an employer seeks to obtain or review work-related data from an employee's personal device, the employer must be careful to exclude any personal data. Certain states also prohibit an employer from requiring an employee to disclose passwords or other credentials to his or her personal email and social networking accounts, but permit an employer to

require employees to share the content of personal online accounts as necessary during an interview while investigating employee misconduct.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

09. What additional considerations apply when the investigation involves whistleblowing?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The provisions of the Whistleblowing Directive must be respected. In Austria, these have been implemented through the Whistleblower Protection Act (HSchG). If the whistleblower or the persons concerned fall within the scope of the Directive, their identity must be protected. Only authorised persons may access the report. Retaliatory measures are invalid or must be reversed. Within a maximum of seven days, the whistleblower must receive a confirmation of his or her complaint. Feedback to the whistleblower must then be provided within a maximum of three months.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

If an employee complains to his or her superiors about grievances or misconduct in the workplace and is subsequently dismissed, this may constitute an unlawful termination (article 336, Swiss Code of Obligations). However, the prerequisite for this is that the employee behaves in good faith, which is not the case if he or she is (partly) responsible for the grievance.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

It is down to the employer's discretion and subject to the whistleblowing policy (if any) to commence the investigation resulting from a complaint from a whistleblower. Whistleblowers and those who cooperate with an investigation should be protected. Normally the employer would not try to identify the whistleblowers. Also, it is best not to reveal the identity of the witness or the source of information; otherwise, they may feel uncomfortable giving information or raising their concerns next time. Any allegations of retaliation that surface during the investigation should be treated as a new report of possible misconduct that could be subject to additional investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Several federal, state, and local employment laws prohibit retaliation against employees who come forward with complaints or participate in corporate investigations. Employees who possess information regarding corporate misconduct may also be considered whistleblowers protected from retaliation under federal and state whistleblower laws, including but not limited to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010.

An employee generally does not need to show that he or she was terminated or demoted to bring a retaliation claim; other actions on the part of the employer may qualify if they could be seen to discourage employees from raising complaints. To protect against a potential retaliation claim, employers should make clear at the outset of an investigation that retaliation will not be tolerated and require the complaining employee (and potentially his or her manager) to bring any instances of retaliation to the investigator's attention immediately.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If the report and the whistleblower fall within the scope of the Whistleblowing Directive, his or her identity must be protected. From a data protection perspective, the principles of the DSG must be observed to protect the legitimate confidentiality of the individuals concerned.

Furthermore, the employer should ensure that information is only disclosed to trustworthy persons to avoid pre-judgements.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

Besides the employee's duty of performance (article 319, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employment relationship is defined by the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and the employee's duty of loyalty (article 321a, Swiss Code of Obligations). Ancillary duties can be derived from the two duties, which are of importance for the confidentiality of an internal investigation.[\[1\]](#)

In principle, the employer must respect and protect the personality (including confidentiality and privacy) and integrity of the employee (article 328 paragraph 1, Swiss Code of Obligations) and take appropriate measures to protect the employee. Because of the danger of pre-judgment or damage to reputation as well as other adverse consequences, the employer must conduct an internal investigation discreetly and objectively. The limits of the duty of care are found in the legitimate self-interest of the employer.[\[2\]](#)

In return for the employer's duty of care, employees must comply with their duty of loyalty and safeguard

the employer's legitimate interests. In connection with an internal investigation, employees must therefore keep the conduct of an investigation confidential. Additionally, employees must keep confidential and not disclose to any third party any facts that they have acquired in the course of the employment relationship, and which are neither obvious nor publicly accessible.^[3]

[1] Wolfgang Portmann/Roger Rudolph, BSK OR, Art. 328 N 1 et seq.

[2] Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 202.

[3] David Rosenthal et al., Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 133.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Unless the investigation is handled by a qualified professional (eg, attorney or auditor) where certain privileges apply, confidentiality obligations are generally subject to the contractual arrangement between the parties involved in the investigation. The employers need to inform any persons, including the investigators, to respect confidentiality obligations because a leak of the information gathered from the investigations could cause damage to relevant parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Information arising from the initial complaint, interviews and records should be kept as confidential as practically possible while still permitting a thorough investigation. Although an employer must maintain confidentiality to the best of its ability, it is often not possible to keep confidential the identity of the complainant or all information gathered through the investigation process. An employer should therefore not promise absolute confidentiality to any party involved in an internal investigation, including the complainant. The investigator should instead explain at the outset to the complaining party and all individuals involved that information gathered will be maintained in confidence to the extent possible, but that some information may be revealed to the accused or potential witnesses on a need-to-know basis to conduct a thorough and effective investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

11. What information must the employee under investigation be given about the allegations against them?

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The purpose of internal investigations would be jeopardised by fully informing a suspected employee beforehand, as it would allow him or her to hide or destroy possible evidence, plan his testimony or coordinate with other employees.

There is no legal requirement to inform the employee of the allegations or suspicions.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

As a result of the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), employees under investigation have certain procedural rights. These include, in principle, the right of the accused to be heard. In this context, the accused has the right to be informed at the beginning of the questioning about the subject of the investigation and at least the main allegations and they must be allowed to share their view and provide exculpatory evidence.^[1] The employer, on the other hand, is not obliged to provide the employee with existing evidence, documents, etc, before the start of the questioning.^[2]

Covert investigations in which employees are involved in informal or even private conversations to induce them to provide statements are not compatible with the data-processing principles of good faith and the requirement of recognisability, according to article 4 of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection.^[3]

Also, rights to information arise from the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. In principle, the right to information (article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) is linked to a corresponding request for information by the concerned person and the existence of data collection within the meaning of article 3 (lit. g), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. Insofar as the documents from the internal investigation recognisably relate to a specific person, there is in principle a right to information concerning these documents. Subject to certain conditions, the right to information may be denied, restricted or postponed by law (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). For example, such documents and reports may also affect the confidentiality and protection interests of third parties, such as other employees. Based on the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employer is required to protect them by taking appropriate measures (eg, by making appropriate redactions before handing out copies of the respective documents (article 9 paragraph 1 (lit. b), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection)).^[4] Furthermore, the employer may refuse, restrict or defer the provision of information where the company's interests override the employee's, and not disclose personal data to third parties (article 9 paragraph 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). The right to information is also not subject to the statute of limitations, and individuals may waive their right to information in advance (article 8 paragraph 6, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). If there are corresponding requests, the employer must generally grant access, or provide a substantiated decision on the restriction of the right of access, within 30 days (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 paragraph 4, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection).

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

^[2] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 390.

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

[4] Claudia Götz Staehelin, Unternehmensinterne Untersuchungen, 2019, p. 37.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The subject employee(s) should be informed of the details of the allegations, such as the details of wrongdoing or violations, made against them. This creates a fair opportunity for them to clarify themselves and defend against such allegations properly. Also, if there is any evidence that needs clarification from the employee, it should be shown to the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

The investigator must disclose to the employee under investigation the purpose of the investigation and, where the investigator is in-house or outside counsel, he or she should disclose that the company is the client.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

When dealing with reports and persons covered by the HSchG, the provisions on identity protection must be followed. In all internal investigations, only authorised persons should receive information.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



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



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

It is generally possible to keep the identity of the complainant, witnesses, or information sources confidential. There is no mandatory rule to disclose the identity of a complainant, witnesses, or sources of information. If the complainant, witnesses, or sources of information for the investigation know that their identities would not be disclosed, they will be more confident in cooperating with and supporting the investigations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

In general, except as provided above, depending on the seriousness of the complaint and investigation, the only persons who should be aware of it are the relevant individual in human resources or legal, and where different, the persons assigned to investigate. Although it may not be feasible to maintain absolute confidentiality in conducting an investigation depending on the nature of the allegations, investigators should exercise discretion at all times and, where possible, avoid identifying complainants, the subject of the investigation or witnesses by name where it is not necessary, and where doing so could be detrimental to the fact-finding process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

13. Can non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) be used to

keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

According to section 6(1) of the DSG, employees who have access to personal data in the course of their professional activities must maintain data confidentiality and continue to do so even after termination of their employment.

Non-disclosure agreements can generally be used to achieve this but are subject to certain restrictions. They may not be used to conceal criminal activity, violate the privacy rights of individuals, circumvent legal disclosure obligations, prevent the exercise of legal rights or contain clauses that violate existing laws, in particular data protection regulations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

In addition to the above-mentioned statutory confidentiality obligations, separate non-disclosure agreements can be signed. In an internal investigation, the employee should be expressly instructed to maintain confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Non-disclosure agreements can be made between an employer and employees who are involved in an investigation. This may include investigators and witnesses, apart from the employee under investigation. This minimises the risk of information being leaked, which can affect all parties related to the workplace investigation. However, an NDA is not absolute means to prevent the disclosure of confidential information, as the court has the authority to compel disclosure.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

This is a fact-specific inquiry that depends on the specific circumstances and laws of the relevant state. In general, NDAs are frowned upon but can be used to an extent to keep certain facts and the substance of an investigation confidential. NDAs can never prevent employees from assisting in official agency

investigations, however. NDAs also cannot lawfully prohibit employees from officially reporting illegal conduct by their employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If a lawyer is involved in the investigation, communication between the lawyer and client is subject to legal professional privilege. These communications must not be disclosed. Any documents collected by an internal audit can be seized and used. However, a document created by a lawyer can only be seized. The same applies to other professional representatives of parties, such as notaries and auditors, as potential holders of professional secrecy.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

As outlined above, all employees generally have the right to know whether and what personal data is being or has been processed about them (article 8 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection; article 328b, Swiss Code of Obligations).

The employer may refuse, restrict or postpone the disclosure or inspection of internal investigation documents if a legal statute so provides, if such action is necessary because of overriding third-party interests (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) or if the request for information is manifestly unfounded or malicious. Furthermore, a restriction is possible if overriding the self-interests of the responsible company requires such a measure and it also does not disclose the personal data to third parties. The employer or responsible party must justify its decision (article 9 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection).^[1]

The scope of the disclosure of information must, therefore, be determined by carefully weighing the interests of all parties involved in the internal investigation.

^[1] Claudia M. Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz*, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 284 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*

at Chandler MHM

Client-attorney privilege between qualified attorneys and the client (ie, an employer) begins once information is made available to the attorney, regardless of the form it takes.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

For legal privilege to apply, a primary purpose of the investigation should be to provide legal advice to the company, including concerning non-lawyers working at the counsel's direction, and legal privilege likely will not apply to internal investigations performed as part of the ordinary course of business or where the investigation is required by a state or federal regulatory regime (eg, post-incident investigations of operations governed by OSHA's Process Safety Management Standards). It is, therefore, important to contemporaneously document the scope and purpose of the investigation and not risk waiving privilege by sharing privileged materials with unnecessary third parties.

Whereas attorney-client privilege includes only communications between an attorney and the client, work-product privilege is broader and includes materials prepared or collected by persons other than the attorney with an eye towards impending litigation. Examples of potential work products produced by attorneys in the context of an investigation include investigative work plans, interview outlines, memoranda summarising witness interviews and investigative reports.

As a practical matter, employees should be aware that communications with other employees or colleagues regarding the investigation are not privileged regardless of whether the colleague is also involved in the investigation or represented by the same counsel. Even if an employee believes he or she is sharing attorney communications with other employees who need to know the attorney's advice and who also have attorney-client privilege with the same counsel because he or she is involved or implicated in the investigation and also represented by company counsel, it is always prudent to refrain from sharing privileged information. If an attorney's communication is shared beyond those who need to know, attorney-client privilege may be destroyed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

15. Does the employee under investigation have a right to be accompanied or have legal representation during the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, an employee is not entitled to have a representative present during investigations. However, he is free to reach out to the works council or independently contact a lawyer for advice. The employer must hear the works council upon his or her request on all matters concerning the interests of employees at the company. Once disciplinary proceedings begin, the employee has the right to be represented by a lawyer.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

In the case of an employee involved in an internal investigation, a distinction must be made as to whether the employee is acting purely as an informant or whether there are conflicting interests between the company and the employee involved. If the employee is acting purely as an informant, the employee has, in principle, no right to be accompanied by their own legal representative.^[1]

However, if there are conflicting interests between the company and the employee involved, when the employee is accused of any misconduct, the employee must be able to be accompanied by their own legal representative. For example, if the employee's conduct might potentially constitute a criminal offence, the involvement of a legal representative must be permitted.^[2] Failure to allow an accused person to be accompanied by a legal representative during an internal investigation, even though the facts in question are relevant to criminal law, raises the question of the admissibility of statements made in a subsequent criminal proceeding. The principles of the Swiss Criminal Procedure Code cannot be undermined by alternatively collecting evidence in civil proceedings and thus circumventing the stricter rules applicable in criminal proceedings.^[3]

In general, it is advisable to allow the involvement of a legal representative to increase the willingness of the employee involved to cooperate.

^[1] Claudia Götz Staehelin, *Unternehmensinterne Untersuchungen*, 2019, p. 37.

^[2] Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, *Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen*, in: Jusletter 18 February 2019, N 59.

^[3] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 392; Niklaus Ruckstuhl, BSK-StPO, Art. 158 StPO N 36.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Unless the work regulations provide otherwise, an employee has the right to request legal representation during an investigation. If legal representation is requested, it is an opportunity for the employer to confirm and verify that an investigation is being conducted fairly, as the employee under investigation can bring his or her lawyer to attend the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Employees generally have no automatic right to counsel in connection with an internal investigation, unless contractually provided for under the terms of an employment agreement. Nonetheless, employees may choose to retain counsel, particularly if they face liability.

16. If there is a works council or trade union, does it have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The Austrian Labour Constitution Act (ArbVG) does not contain any provisions regarding workplace investigations. The employee has the right to address the works council but is not entitled to have the works council comply with his or her request.

The works council's opportunities for participation are conclusively regulated. Certain investigative or control measures may require the consent or co-determination of the works council.

Under section 96(1)3 ArbVG, the consent of the works council is required if the employer wishes to introduce and maintain control measures or technical systems for monitoring employees that affect human dignity, such as video surveillance or specific staff questionnaires. If there is no works council, the consent of each individual employee is required.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

In general, works councils and trade unions are not very common in Switzerland and there are no statutory rules that would provide a works council or trade union a right to be informed or involved in an ongoing internal investigation. However, respective obligations might be foreseen in an applicable collective bargaining agreement, internal regulations or similar.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Thai labor laws do not require a workplace investigation to involve participation from trade unions or labour unions. However, it is possible for labour unions established under the Labor Relation Act BE. 2518 (1975) to submit a demand for a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with employers to get a seat at the table. There was a case where a management union made a CBA with the employer wherein the president of the management union would be involved in any investigation of any manager, who is a union member, under investigation. In that case, the employer must comply with the CBA by informing the president and allowing the president to participate in the investigations.



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Employers generally have no obligation to inform employees of their right to union representation or to ask if they would like a union representative present during the interview. Union employees may insist, however, that a union representative attend any investigatory interview that could lead to the employee's punishment, although the union representative may not interfere with the interview.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

17. What other support can employees involved in the investigation be given?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

There is no additional support for the employees concerned. However, the employer may offer support measures to the employees to ensure better cooperation. The choice of support measures is at the employer's discretion. For example, the employer could offer to bear lawyer's fees, if the employee is cooperative. Such decisions must always be made on a case-by-case basis.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

The employer does not generally need to provide specific support for employees that are subject to an internal investigation. The employer may, however, allow concerned employees to be accompanied by a trusted third party such as family members or friends.^[1] These third parties will need to sign separate non-disclosure agreements before being involved in the internal investigation.

In addition, a company may appoint a so-called lawyer of confidence who has been approved by the employer and is thus subject to professional secrecy. This lawyer will not be involved in the internal investigation but may look after the concerned employees and give them confidential advice as well as inform them about their rights and obligations arising from the employment relationship.^[2]

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

^[2] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern, 2021, p. 133.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The employees may then file a complaint with the labour inspection officer of the Labour Protection and Welfare Department to investigate the situation if they view that the conduct of the employer in the investigation violates the LPA. For example, if the employer issues a written order for suspending an employee for more than seven days. The labour inspection officer may issue an order requesting compliance, where failure to comply with such an order would result in a criminal penalty.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

The employer's counsel should provide an *Upjohn* warning at the start of any interview, and delivery of the warning should be documented by a note-taker. An *Upjohn* warning is the notice an attorney (in-house or outside counsel) provides a company employee to inform the employee that the attorney represents only the company and not the employee individually.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

18. What if unrelated matters are revealed as a result of the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer must decide how to deal with this information. Possible options are to initiate separate and unrelated investigations or to extend the ongoing investigations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

There are no regulations in this regard in the Swiss employment law framework. However, in criminal proceedings, the rules regarding accidental findings apply (eg, article 243, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for searches and examinations or article 278, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for surveillance of post and

telecommunications). In principle, accidental findings are usable, with the caveat of general prohibitions on the use of evidence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Subject to the grievance protocol in place, any matter that emerges during the investigation should be handled separately as a fresh report of potential misconduct that needs further investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Where new issues or claims arise during an ongoing workplace investigation, the investigator should discuss with in-house counsel whether the new issues or claims should be separately investigated and if so, by whom, or if instead those new issues or claims are sufficiently related to the current review that they can be investigated in parallel and incorporated into the ongoing fact-gathering process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

19. What if the employee under investigation raises a grievance during the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Provided the employer complies with labour law and data protection regulations, internal investigations are lawful and are not regarded as administrative or judicial proceedings. If legal consequences for not cooperating, such as dismissal, are threatened by the employer or his investigators, the offence of coercion under section 105 of the Austrian Criminal Code could be fulfilled.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

In the context of private internal investigations, grievances initially raised by the employee do not usually have an impact on the investigation.

However, if the employer terminates the employment contract due to a justified legal complaint raised by an employee, a court might consider the termination to be abusive and award the employee compensation in an amount to be determined by the court but not exceeding six months' pay for the employee (article 336 paragraph 1 (lit. b) and article 337c paragraph 3, Swiss Code of Obligations). Furthermore, a termination by the employer may be challenged if it takes place without good cause following a complaint of discrimination by the employee to a superior or the initiation of proceedings before a conciliation board or a court by the employee (article 10, Federal Act on Gender Equality).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The investigator should guide the employee who has raised the grievance to properly raise their concerns through the grievance protocols or whistleblowing policy (if any). It is acceptable to preliminarily hear their concerns, but the investigation should be initiated separately and subject to the employer's discretion.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Where an employee who is the subject of a workplace investigation raises his or her grievance during the investigation, the investigator should follow the same steps outlined above to triage new issues or claims. The investigator should also discuss with in-house counsel whether any particular steps should be taken to avoid the perception that any disciplinary measures taken against the employee (in the event the original claims are substantiated) were retaliatory.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off sick during the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The involved employee's sick leave does not affect the internal investigation. Most investigative measures can be carried out without the employee's presence.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

The time spent on the internal investigation by the employee should be counted as working time^[1]. The general statutory and internal company principles on sick leave apply. Sick leave for which the respective employee is not responsible must generally be compensated (article 324a paragraph 1 and article 324b, Swiss Code of Obligations). During certain periods of sick leave (blocking period), the employer may not ordinarily terminate the employment contract; however, immediate termination for cause remains possible.

The duration of the blocking period depends on the employee's seniority, amounting to 30 days in the employee's first year of service, 90 days in the employee's second to ninth year of service and 180 days thereafter (article 336c paragraph 1 (lit. c), Swiss Code of Obligations).

[1] Ullin Streiff/Adrian von Kaenel/Roger Rudolph, *Arbeitsvertrag, Praxiskommentar zu Art. 319–362 OR*, 7. A. 2012, Art. 328b N 8 OR.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

If the absence is anticipated to be brief, the employer may wait until the employee's return before concluding the investigation. If the employee's absence is expected to be prolonged, the investigator may alter the time of meetings or request that the employee submits a witness statement. The key point would be that all necessary measures should be taken to give the employee a chance to participate.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

If an employee who is the subject of a workplace investigation becomes sick during the investigation, the investigator should complete as much of the process as possible in the employee's absence, for example by conducting interviews with the complainant and other witnesses and collecting and reviewing relevant documentation. Where the employee's absence is expected to be short-term, the employer can postpone completing the investigation until the employee returns to work and can be interviewed. Where a lengthy absence is expected, the investigator should take steps to ensure that the employee nevertheless has a fair chance to participate in the process, for example by providing the employee with flexibility in scheduling his or her interview or by offering other accommodations such as conducting the interview by video conference instead of requiring an in-person interview, or alternatively meeting in a neutral place instead of the office. It is important to maintain records of the steps taken to accommodate the employee to show that the process was reasonable and fair.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

regulatory investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Private investigations differ from criminal or regulatory investigations. Nevertheless, even for internal investigations, it is advisable to collect evidence in a way that can be admitted in court, as it may have to be presented to the authorities during the investigation process. Generally, any evidence obtained in the course of an internal investigation may be admitted in subsequent administrative or judicial proceedings.

If the evidence is not voluntarily surrendered, seizure or confiscation is possible. Since official proceedings are often lengthy, suspension is not always recommended.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



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



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Employers are not required to wait until the police or regulatory investigations are finished before conducting their disciplinary investigations, but it is necessary to ensure that such internal proceedings do not compromise the integrity of an investigation or result in misrepresentation or a miscarriage of justice. The level of proof for internal disciplinary action is less than the level of proof for criminal proceedings.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Employers have obligations to conduct a thorough and unbiased internal investigation and take prompt remedial action to prevent further workplace violations. As such, absent a criminal or regulatory investigation where the investigators ask the employer to pause an internal investigation, employers should be prepared to continue their internal investigation in parallel with the criminal or regulatory

investigation while cooperating with police or regulatory investigators.

The police and the regulator can often compel the employer to share certain information gathered from its internal investigation. In some cases, the employer should analyse whether the non-disclosure of information evidencing criminal conduct within the company itself constitutes an independent crime or whether an applicable statute or regulation imposes an independent duty to disclose. Alternatively, the employer should consider whether, even absent an affirmative duty to disclose, disclosure of information gathered during an internal investigation may still benefit the employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

22. What must the employee under investigation be told about the outcome of an investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employee has no general right to be informed of the results of an investigation. However, if the employer is considering consequences under labour law based on the result of the investigation, such as termination or dismissal, the employee must be informed accordingly.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

Workplace investigations often result in an investigation report that is intended to serve as the basis for any measures to be taken by the company's decisionmakers.

The employee's right to information based on article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection also covers the investigation report, provided that the report and the data contained therein relate to the employee.^[1] In principle, the employee concerned is entitled to receive a written copy of the entire investigation report free of charge (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 et seq, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection). Redactions may be made where the interests of the company or third parties so require, but they are the exception and must be kept to a minimum.^[2]

^[1] Arbeitsgericht Zürich, Entscheide 2013 No. 16; Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 393 et seq.

^[2] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 394.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

There is no mandatory information on the outcome of an investigation that must be disclosed to an employee. However, disclosure of the outcome should, at a minimum, include whether an employee did or did not commit a violation. In addition, an employee who has committed a violation should be informed of any disciplinary action, and the grounds for such a decision (such as a violation of the company's work rules). This enables the employee under investigation to appeal the outcome if it is applicable under the work rules or whistleblowing policy.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

In general, it is often helpful to provide the complainant and subject of the complaint with a short written communication or verbal communication at the end of an investigation to advise that the investigation has concluded. Where the allegations are unsubstantiated, the communication should convey that no evidence of misconduct or unlawful conduct was found. Where the allegations are substantiated, the results and proposed communication should be reviewed with the legal function, together with potential disciplinary and remedial action, before it is communicated to the complainant and the subject of the complaint.

Where the misconduct alleged poses a high risk to the company from a reputational, operational or legal perspective, and especially where an investigation is conducted by outside counsel, outside counsel should determine, in consultation with the relevant individuals at the company, for example the general counsel, how and with whom to share investigation results and if and how to communicate the outcome to the complainant and the subject of the complaint. This is the case regardless of whether the allegations are found to be substantiated or unsubstantiated.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

23. Should the investigation report be shared in full, or just the findings?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer should determine the intended recipients and format of the report in advance. In many cases, it may be advisable to publish only the results of the investigation to protect the privacy and reputation of the individuals concerned, as this may help to minimise any potential negative impact on them.

However, under certain circumstances or due to legal requirements, full disclosure of the investigation report may be required, especially if transparency and disclosure are necessary to maintain public or investor confidence.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise based on data protection law vis-à-vis the persons concerned (eg, the accused). Likewise, there is no obligation to disclose other documents, such as the records of interviews. The employee should be fully informed of the final investigation report, if necessary, with certain redactions (see question 22). The right of the employee concerned to information is comprehensive (ie, all investigation files must be disclosed to him).^[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.^[2]

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, in: *HR Today*, to be found on: <Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten | hrtoday.ch> (last visited on 27 June 2022).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

It depends on with whom the investigation report should be shared. If there is a court case or criminal case to be further investigated by police, the investigation report should be shared in full as this would be used as documentary evidence to make a case stronger. On the contrary, if the investigation report is requested by the employee under investigation, employers are entitled to use their discretion as to what information to share.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Only the findings should be shared with the complainant and the subject of the complaint.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer may impose consequences under labour law. Consequences may include verbal or written warnings, transfers or other disciplinary measures. The employer may also implement training or educational measures if the issue is due to the employee's lack of knowledge. In serious cases, besides dismissal without notice – for example, if the employer seeks damages – legal action (civil or criminal) may be taken against the employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Switzerland

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

If the investigation uncovers misconduct, the question arises as to what steps should be taken. Of course, the severity of the misconduct and the damage caused play a significant role. Furthermore, it must be noted that the cooperation of the employee concerned may be of decisive importance for the outcome of the investigation. The possibilities are numerous, ranging, for example, from preventive measures to criminal complaints.^[1]

If individual disciplinary actions are necessary, these may range from warnings to ordinary or immediate termination of employment.

[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 180 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

Upon completion of the investigation, the employer can decide to take proper disciplinary action against the employee if it is found that the employee committed an offence or violated the work rules. An employer may also file a report with the police if the findings of the investigation amount to a criminal offence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Where the misconduct alleged is substantiated in whole or in part by an internal investigation, the human resources function, potentially in consultation with in-house or outside counsel, should agree on disciplinary or remedial action to be implemented.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

It is up to management to decide which results should be disclosed and to whom. It is important to know who the persons concerned are and who has an interest in disclosure.

From a legal perspective, disclosure must follow the GDPR. Internal policies can specify how the results are to be handled. Works Council Agreements (WCAs) may also contain regulations on how to deal with internal investigations and the disclosure of results.

There is no requirement to publish the results of the investigation, but it may be advisable to cooperate with the authorities. This is particularly the case if the employer has suffered damage or is himself threatened with prosecution. The release of investigation results can be compelled through the courts.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

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 Romero/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 123.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The investigation findings should be disclosed to a limited group of persons who are involved in the investigation, and for which the findings are useful. For example, an HR manager who needs to record the findings in the employee's record, the police if the employer decides to proceed further with a criminal claim, the court if requested by that court, or if there is a court case related to the violations of the employee.

Interview records should be kept confidential and private. There is a risk of disclosure because the information in the records may be beneficial to one but damaging to others. If the interview records are leaked to others who are not involved in the investigation, it may affect the work environment in the workplace and the protection of witnesses.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Once fact-finding is complete, the investigator should discuss his or her notes with in-house or outside counsel and prepare a summary of the process, high-level findings, and a proposed resolution at the counsel's direction. This report should not include subjective commentary and should also avoid including excessive detail, and generally be treated confidentially during and after the investigation. If the report is requested by regulators or the police, the company should discuss with in-house counsel, and preferably also with outside counsel, how to respond to the request and whether any steps need to be taken to protect any applicable legal privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Data protection law requires that personal data should not be kept longer than necessary for the purpose it was collected. Once the purpose of the internal investigation is fulfilled and the data is no longer needed, it should be deleted or anonymised. Regulations regarding this matter may also be subject to WCAs or internal policies. In any case, it is advisable to keep the results for as long as they may be needed in possible subsequent administrative or judicial proceedings.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

There is no period required by law for keeping the outcome of the investigation on the employee's record. However, if termination of employment is the outcome of the investigation, an employer should keep details of the investigation for at least 10 years, in line with the prescribed period for an employee to file an unfair dismissal claim against an employer. An employer may use the details of an investigation to defend such a claim. For other disciplinary action, the retention of investigation details on the employee's record is at the employer's discretion.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

There is no requirement for the results of a workplace investigation to remain on an employee's record for any specific period. It is often helpful, however, for information relating to the outcome of such an investigation (regardless of whether the allegations are substantiated) to be accessible to the human resources or legal functions such that during the initial complaint intake process described above, any prior complaints and investigations relating to the same individual or group of individuals can be taken into account to identify any recurring issues or systemic violations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

27. What legal exposure could the employer face for errors during the investigation?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

This relates to the severity of the error. Data protection violations can lead to fines by the data protection authority or claims for damages. If consequences under labour law, such as dismissal, have taken place due to erroneous investigations or incorrect results, the employee concerned can assert claims under labour law or seek damages.

Furthermore, there may be consequences under criminal law. This is particularly the case if documents have been falsified in the course of the investigation. It is, therefore, crucial that employers exercise diligence and due process in internal investigations. Investigations must be conducted transparently and lawfully.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Switzerland

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

As there are no specific regulations for internal investigations, the usual legal framework within which the employer must act towards the employee derives from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights.

But, for example, unwarranted surveillance could conceivably result in criminal liability (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code) for violations of the employee's privacy. Furthermore, errors made by the employer could have an impact on any later criminal proceedings (eg, in the form of prohibitions on the use of evidence).[1]

Evidence obtained unlawfully may only be used in civil proceedings if there is an overriding interest in establishing the truth (article 152 paragraph 2, Swiss Civil Procedure Code). Consequently, in each case, a balance must be struck between the individual's interest in not using the evidence and in establishing the truth.[2] The question of the admissibility of evidence based on an unlawful invasion of privacy is a sensitive one – admissibility in this case is likely to be accepted only with restraint.[3] Since the parties in civil proceedings do not have any means of coercion at their disposal, it is not necessary, in contrast to criminal proceedings, to examine whether the evidence could also have been obtained by legal means.[4]

Unlawful action by the employer may also have consequences on future criminal proceedings: The prohibitions on exploitation (article 140 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) apply a priori only to evidence obtained directly from public authorities. Evidence obtained unlawfully by private persons (ie, the employer) may also be used if it could have been lawfully obtained by the authority and if the interest in establishing the truth outweighs the interest of the individual in not using the evidence.[5] Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code remains reserved: Evidence obtained in violation of Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code is subject to an absolute ban on the use of evidence (e.g. evidence obtained under the use of torture)[6].[7]

[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

[3] Pascal Grolimund in: Adrian Staehelin/Daniel Staehelin/Pascal Grolimund (editors), *Zivilprozessrecht*, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2019, 3rd Edition, §18 N 24a.

[4] Pascal Grolimund in: Adrian Staehelin/Daniel Staehelin/Pascal Grolimund (editors), Zivilprozessrecht, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2019, 3rd Edition, §18 N 24a.

[5] Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 6B_1241/2016 dated 17. July 2017 consid. 1.2.2; Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 1B_22/2012 dated 11 May 2012 consid. 2.4.4.

[6] Jérôme Benedict/Jean Treccani, CR-CPP Art. 140 N. 5 and Art. 141 N. 3.

[7] Yvan Jeanneret/André Kuhn, Précis de procédure pénale, 2nd Edition, Berne 2018, N 9011.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*
at Chandler MHM

The Thai Supreme Court has ruled that the termination of an employee was unfair due to an investigation being conducted contrary to requirements in the company's work rules. As such, employers may be liable for damages to employees if there are errors made during investigations, or where investigations are not conducted properly.

The Supreme Court has also ruled that in cases of unfair termination, the underlying cause of the termination should be the determining factor, rather than other issues, including investigative procedures.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

The subject of the investigation, the complainant, or a government agency investigating the same alleged misconduct could subject the employer to legal exposure. It is, therefore, helpful for a company to prepare a contemporaneous report of the investigation that summarises: the incident or issues investigated, including dates; the parties involved; key factual and credibility findings; employer policies or guidelines and their applicability to the investigation; specific conclusions; the party (or parties) responsible for making the final determination; issues that could not be resolved through the internal investigation; and employer actions taken.

The employer should also maintain a clear record of the steps taken to investigate the alleged misconduct and any findings, as well as all evidence gathered during the investigation, including documents collected and reviewed, any work done to identify systemic issues or patterns of behaviour, and notes from all interviews, which should be limited to the facts gathered, dated and should indicate the duration and location of the interview.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Austria

Michaela Gerlach
Sonia Ben Brahim
GERLACH



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



Thailand

Ratthai Kamolwarin
Norrapat Werajong
Chandler MHM



United States

Rachel G. Skaistis
Eric W. Hilfers
Jenny X. Zhang
Cravath, Swaine & Moore

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com