

# 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?

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

There is no specific legislation regarding a workplace investigation. In general, an employer has the right to investigate incidents at the workplace based on their authority over employees. However, the investigative powers of the employer are among others limited by the general right to privacy, which is also enshrined in Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 81 of 26 April 2002 to protect the privacy of employees concerning the control of electronic online data. If there are official complaints by employees due to sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, well-being legislation provides a specific procedure. Also, upcoming whistleblower rules include some specifications for an investigation, but at the time of publication these are not yet final (we refer to is in more detail below). The information below is only valid for workplace investigations in the private sector. The public sector has a set of specific rules and principles, which are outside the scope of this chapter.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Workplace investigations in Sweden are governed by several rules and regulations. Listed below are the central legislation and regulations that govern a workplace investigation related to alleged employee misconduct.

- The Swedish Discrimination Act (2008:567).
- The Swedish Work Environment Act (1977:1160), which is complemented by the Swedish Work Environment Authority's other statutes.[\[1\]](#)
- The Swedish Whistleblowing Act (2021:890).

If a workplace investigation has been initiated after the receipt of a report filed through a reporting channel established under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, that law applies provided that the report has been filed

by a person who may report under the Act and provided that the subject of the report falls under the material scope of the Act. The Swedish Whistleblowing Act implements Directive (EU) 2019/1937 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law and has been given a wide material scope in Sweden. The Swedish Whistleblowing Act may apply if the reported irregularity concerns breaches of certain EU laws or if the reported irregularity is of public interest.

In addition to the regulations mentioned above, certain data protection legislation may affect workplace investigations by restricting what personal data may be processed. Such data protection legislation includes the following:

- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons concerning the processing of personal data and the free movement of such data (the GDPR);
- the Swedish Supplementary Data Protection Act (2018:218);
- the Swedish Supplementary Data Protection Regulation (2018:219);
- Regulation DIFS:2018:2 on the processing of personal data relating to criminal convictions or offences. This regulation governs the processing of personal data relating to criminal convictions or suspected criminal offences in internal workplace investigations that are not governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act.[\[2\]](#)

The above-mentioned legislation and regulations may overlap in many aspects and it is therefore important before starting an investigation, as well as during an investigation, to assess which rules and regulations apply to the situation at hand. Another aspect of this is that many issues that can arise during an investigation are not regulated by law or other legislation. If the investigation is a non-whistleblowing investigation there are limited rules on exactly how and by whom the investigation should be carried out.

A Swedish law firm that undertakes a workplace investigation also has to adhere to the Swedish Bar Association's Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct includes additional considerations, mainly ethical, which will not be addressed in this submission. Furthermore, this submission will not focus on investigations following an employee's possible misappropriation of proprietary information or breach of the Swedish Trade Secrets Act (2018:558). Investigations into such irregularities are often conducted to gather evidence and these investigations include the same or similar investigative measures used in other investigations, such as interviews with employees and IT-forensic searches, but also infringement investigations carried out by the authorities or other measures by the police.

---

[\[1\]](#) Mainly Systematic Work Environment Management (AFS 2001:1), Organisational and Social Work Environment (AFS 2015:4) and Violence and Menaces in the Working Environment (AFS 1993:2)

[\[2\]](#) Under Section 2 item 4 of DIFS 2018:2, personal data relating to criminal convictions or suspected criminal offences may only be processed if the personal data concerns serious misconduct, such as bribery, corruption, financial fraud or serious threats to the environment, health and safety, by an individual who is in a leading position or who is considered key personnel within the company. The processing of personal data received in a report or collected during an investigation governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act is instead governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, which complements the GDPR and the supplementing Swedish act and regulation stated in item (ii) and (iii) above.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

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

There is no specific legal regulation for internal investigations in Switzerland. The legal framework is derived from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights. Depending on the context of the investigation, additional legal

provisions may apply; for instance, additional provisions of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection or the Swiss Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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?

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

First, the employer should appoint an investigator or investigative team that will be responsible for conducting the investigation. Next, the employer or the investigators might think about communicating with the involved employees. It depends on the situation if this is a good idea or not. In general, it can be recommended that the employer is transparent towards the involved employees and openly communicates about the (start of the) investigation process. This is definitively the case if it is already clear that the involved employees are under scrutiny because of their actions. In this case, the actual investigation can begin with a hearing of the involved employees. However, if there is a risk that employees will hide or destroy evidence or will collude to prevent the employer from finding the truth, the investigation can also start without any communication. In this case, it would be better to start collecting evidence before hearing from the employees involved.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

An investigation can be initiated in several ways. It is usually as a result of whistleblowing or a report on work environment deficiencies, or through other channels (eg, HR, the police, media coverage).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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).<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

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

<sup>[2]</sup> Klaus Moosmayer, *Compliance, Praxisleitfaden für Unternehmen*, 2. A. München 2015, N 314.

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)?

#### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In principle, you cannot unilaterally suspend an employee during a workplace investigation, as there is a risk of constructive dismissal (ie, wrongful termination of the employment contract by the unilateral modification of one of its essential elements). Consequences could include the payment of an indemnity in lieu of notice based on seniority as foreseen by the Employment Contracts Act, plus possible damages (three to 17 weeks remuneration if an unreasonable dismissal, plus alternative or additional damages based on real prejudice suffered). The parties can nevertheless agree on a suspension of the employment contract. In this scenario, the remuneration will still have to be paid. Furthermore, a suspension could be a sanction that follows the outcome of the investigation, but even then it will only be possible for a limited time (and a suspension without pay is usually only allowed by the courts for a maximum of three days). However, if the complaint is about sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, the prevention advisor (see question 4) can recommend that the employer take certain actions, which in grave circumstances could lead to employee suspension. The suspended employee should continue to receive his pay if this occurs.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

#### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

In general, an employee in the private sector may be temporarily suspended for a short period with pay and other benefits during a workplace investigation. The room for suspension without pay is, by contrast, very limited. An applicable collective bargaining agreement may impose additional restrictions on the right to temporarily suspend an employee. The suspension should be limited in time and only be in force during the investigation, but can be repeated for (multiple) additional short periods if necessary to conclude the investigation. An assessment needs to be made on a case-by-case basis as suspension in some cases may be considered unlawful. If not executed with sufficient consideration of the employee's interests, it may be considered a constructive dismissal or a breach of the employer's work environment obligations. If the employee is unionised, trade unions sometimes request that the employer initiates consultations as part of a decision to suspend an employee.

In the public sector, the right to suspension is limited. There are also special regulations regarding the suspension of certain employees, for example, employees who are employed as permanent judges.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

#### Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

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

---

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

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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, there are no legal minimum qualifications, the employer can delegate the investigation task to anyone. Of course, it is strongly recommended to appoint someone who is not involved in the case and who can lead the investigation objectively with the necessary authority to take investigative measures.

However, in the specific case of an official complaint due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the investigation will be conducted by the prevention advisor for psychosocial aspects. Next, if the investigation is based on an internal whistleblowing report, there will have to be an independent reporting manager responsible for receiving the report, giving feedback to the whistleblower and ensuring a decent follow-up to the report. Logically, the reporting manager will lead the investigation in this case, but he can be assisted by other persons or a team who are bound by a duty of confidentiality.



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the workplace investigation falls under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, the investigation has to be conducted by independent and autonomous persons or entities designated under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act as competent to investigate reports.

If the workplace investigation is not governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, there are no minimum qualification requirements. When appointing an investigator, one should consider who would be most suitable in the given situation. For example, it may in some situations be more suitable to have an external investigator to ensure impartiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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<sup>[1]</sup>, 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



## 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?



### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

This is only possible if the employee claims that his or her rights (eg, the right to privacy) are violated by the investigation (but this will merely limit the investigation methods) or if he or she finds that the investigation constitutes an abuse of rights. In any case, it will be very hard for an employee to completely halt the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

No. It should, however, be noted that the employee under investigation may claim a right to rectification under article 16 of the GDPR and its right to object to processing under article 21 of the GDPR. This may give the employee under investigation an undesirable opportunity to withhold evidence and obstruct or impede the investigation. The risk of these rights being exercised is, however, considered to be low.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### 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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

Employees cannot be forced by their employer to act as a witness. If they decide to nonetheless testify as a witness, they do not, in principle, have particular rights. If the employee puts himself in a difficult or even dangerous position to act as a witness, it is up to the employer to offer the necessary protection or take measures to prevent any harm (eg, by keeping the identity of the witness confidential or by planning the hearing at a place or time when the employees involved are not aware of it).

However, this is not the case for whistleblowing reports, where a witness might be seen as a “facilitator” who can receive protection against any retaliation by the employer.

Also, workers who were direct witnesses to official allegations of sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work are protected against retaliation by the employer. This also applies to witnesses in court.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

In general, yes, employees in Sweden have a far-reaching duty of loyalty toward their employers. This includes, among other things, a duty to truthfully answer an employer's questions and to inform the employer of events that may be of interest to the employer. An employee's obligation to assist is, however, more limited when assistance would entail self-incrimination.

A person acting as a witness under an investigation governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act will be protected by confidentiality. Personal data and details that could reveal the identity of a witness may not be disclosed without authorisation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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.<sup>[1]</sup> 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).<sup>[2]</sup>

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on [hrtoday.ch](https://www.hrtoday.ch), last visited on 17 June 2022.

<sup>[2]</sup> Same opinion: Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on [hrtoday.ch](https://www.hrtoday.ch), last visited on 17 June 2022.

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?



### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

Here, the investigation “collides” with the right to privacy of the persons involved.

First, the rules and principles of the GDPR will apply if personal data is involved. Therefore, the employer will have to find a data-processing ground, which could be his or her legitimate interest or the fact that the investigation could lead to legal proceedings, etc. The data processing should also be limited to what is proportionate and the data subjects should be informed. Due to this obligation, it is arguable that the GDPR policy already provides the necessary information for the employees not to jeopardise the investigation. In any case, data subjects should not be able to use their right to access data to ascertain the preliminary findings of the investigation (which are confidential) or any confidential identities involved (eg, in the whistleblower procedure, the identity of the report should be protected at all times).

Also, the employer should follow the procedure of Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 81 on searching the e-mails or computer files and internet searches of employees. This CBA limits the purposes for searches and lays down a double-phase procedure that needs to be followed if private data is involved. Next to this, the employer should also take into account the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, which only allows e-mail and computer searches based on the following:

- whether the employee has been notified of the possibility that the employer might take measures to monitor correspondence and the implementation of such measures;
- the extent of the monitoring and the degree of intrusion into the employee’s privacy (including a distinction between the monitoring of the flow or the content of the communications);
- whether the employer has provided legitimate reasons to justify monitoring of the communications and accessing of their actual content; and
- whether it would have been possible to establish a monitoring system based on less intrusive measures, the consequences of the monitoring for the employee who is subject to it, and whether the employee had been provided with adequate safeguards.

Next, if the employer wants to use camera images, the rules of Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 68 should have been followed when installing cameras. If not, the images might have been collected illegally.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

To the extent the gathering of physical evidence includes the processing of personal data, please see question 1.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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.<sup>[1]</sup>

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.<sup>[2]</sup> 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.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen, in: Jusletter 18 February 2019, N 52.

<sup>[2]</sup> Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 148.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## United States

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

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

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

The employer is, in principle, not entitled to search the employee's private possessions, except with the explicit consent of the employee. Digital files on the computer or laptop of an employee can be searched under the rules of CBA No. 81 (see question 7) and other privacy rules.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

An employer can search an employee's personal possessions (eg, handbag, pockets and locker) if the employer has a legitimate interest in a search. This could, for example, include a reasonable suspicion of theft of employer property. Furthermore, an employer may search, but not continually monitor, an employee's computer and email provided that it is in accordance with GDPR requirements. For the processing to be lawful under the GDPR, the employer has to establish a purpose and a legal basis for the processing of personal data. Furthermore, data subjects must have received information on the legal basis for and purpose of the processing of personal data beforehand. If the data subjects have not received such information, the employer's right to process their data is limited. However, if the employer has reasonable grounds to believe that trade secrets or similar has been copied and stolen, no such requirements would typically apply.

Investigations into an employee's possessions may, under certain circumstances, also be carried out by the Swedish authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### 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.<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

[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.



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is based on a whistleblower report that falls under the scope of the upcoming rules, the investigators are bound by a strict duty of confidentiality, especially regarding the identity of the report. The rules also provide some procedural deadlines for feeding back to the reporter. Within seven days of receiving the report through an internal reporting channel, the reporting manager needs to send a receipt to the whistleblower. From that moment, the reporting manager has three months to investigate the report and give feedback and an adequate follow-up to the report. Next, the rules offer strong protection against any retaliatory measures the reporter may experience. Regardless, these rules are mostly intended to offer the necessary protection for whistleblowers and to ensure that companies take necessary investigative steps following a report, but they do not include much information about the actual procedure of the investigation besides certain deadlines, nor do they deal with other employees involved (or under investigation).



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act governs the investigation, additional considerations apply relating to who may investigate a reported irregularity (see question 4) and the duty of confidentiality and restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data in investigations (see questions 6, 10 and 11), as well as the rights and protections of whistleblowers.

As regards the rights and protections of whistleblowers, the following can be noted. A person reporting in a reporting channel governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act is protected against retaliation and restrictive measures. Thus, companies are prohibited from preventing or trying to prevent a person from reporting, and retaliating against a person who reports. Furthermore, a reporting person will not be held liable for breach of confidentiality for collecting the reported information if the person had reasonable grounds to believe that it was necessary to submit the report to expose irregularities. Under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, any person reporting irregularities in a reporting channel established under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act may also report irregularities to designated Swedish authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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



## 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.

## 10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

A workplace investigation is often a sensitive matter that requires necessary confidentiality to find out the truth discreetly and objectively. Nevertheless, there is often pressure from employees, trade unions or even the media and general public to be transparent and communicate about the case. From a legal perspective, it is not recommended to communicate openly about an ongoing investigation, as this can jeopardise the investigation or the possibility of taking disciplinary measures.

Whistleblower investigations will be bound by a strict duty of confidentiality regarding anything that could reveal the identity of the reporter.

In complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the prevention adviser is bound by professional secrecy. Consequently, he or she may not disclose to third parties any information about individuals that have come to his or her knowledge in the performance of his or her duties. However, he or she still has the freedom to inform the people concerned to carry out his or her tasks in the procedure.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the persons or entities handling the investigation have a duty of confidentiality and may not, without permission, disclose any information that could reveal the identity of the reporting person, any person subject to the report or any other person mentioned in the report or during the investigation of the report. Access to personal data is limited to designated competent entities or persons. Investigative material including personal data may not be shared with other persons or entities during the investigation. Once the investigation has reached actionable conclusions, investigative material may be shared with other persons or entities, such as HR or the police, provided that such sharing is necessary to take action on the outcome of the investigation. Investigative material may also be shared if it is necessary for the use of reports as evidence in legal proceedings or under the law or other regulations.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act does not apply, there are no particular confidentiality obligations for employers. Yet, an employer needs to consider what information is suitable to share during an investigation, how this is done and to whom it is shared. An employer must also respect employees' privacy in line with what is generally considered good practice in the labour market. This means that an employer should be careful as to what sensitive and personal information is shared during an investigation. Furthermore, the spreading of damaging information (even if true) about an employee to a wider group may be a criminal offence under the Swedish Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022





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.<sup>[1]</sup>

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.<sup>[2]</sup>

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.<sup>[3]</sup>

---

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

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

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

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?**

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, the employee should be informed that there is an ongoing investigation (unless this could jeopardise the investigation, in which case disclosure could be postponed until this is no longer the situation). Next, before imposing measures or sanctions, the employee should be allowed to be heard or to give his or her version of the facts. Of course, the employee can only do this if he or she is aware of the facts being investigated. It is not necessary to give the employee a full insight into the investigation, only the necessary facts that allow him or her to offer a defence are sufficient.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

According to article 14 of the GDPR, no information must be provided. The exemption in article 14.5(b) applies to the extent the obligation to provide such information is likely to render impossible or seriously impair the objectives of the processing of the personal data of the employee under investigation (ie, to diligently investigate the suspected irregularity).

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, information about where the personal data processed originates from may not be provided under article 14 of the GDPR, as the personal data must remain confidential subject to obligations under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act.

In addition to the above, an investigation should, to the extent possible and suitable, be characterised by the principles in ECHR (particularly articles 6 and 8). The employee under investigation should, among other things, be presented with sufficient information to safeguard his or her interests and be allowed to respond to the allegations. The investigation must also be compliant with the work environment responsibilities that the employer has concerning the involved parties (see questions 17 and 20).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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.<sup>[1]</sup> The employer, on the other hand, is not obliged to provide the employee with existing evidence, documents, etc, before the start of the questioning.<sup>[2]</sup>

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.<sup>[3]</sup>

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)).<sup>[4]</sup> 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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the complainant made use of an internal whistleblowing procedure, confidentiality regarding the identity of a reporter is mandatory. Also, in other cases and for other involved persons (witnesses), it is recommended to keep their identity confidential to prevent the risk of intimidation or other negative consequences.

In complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, if the prevention adviser heard or took written statements from persons that were considered useful for the evaluation, these persons may remain anonymous.

The employee must, nevertheless, receive sufficient information to be able to offer a defence concerning the facts of which he or she is accused.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, their identity must be kept confidential under the duty of confidentiality. If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act does not apply, their identity can to a large extent be kept confidential.

It can also be noted that a workplace investigation carried out in the public sector will often (eventually) become an official document, which means that the document can be requested by the public. There are, however, provisions on secrecy that may restrict the right to gain access to official documents. These provisions are found in the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act (2009:400).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

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

However, in combination with the right to be heard and the right to be informed regarding an investigation, the accused also has the right that incriminating evidence is presented to them throughout the investigation and that they can comment on it. For instance, this right includes disclosure of the persons accusing them and their concrete statements. Anonymisation or redaction of such statements is permissible if the interests of the persons incriminating the accused or the interests of the employer override the accused's 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.<sup>[1]</sup>

---

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

## 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?**

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In principle this is possible. However, these NDAs do have their limits and cannot prevent involved persons from, for example, bringing a legal claim or filing a report if they are legally entitled to do so. Under whistleblower rules, a reporter can even publish his or her complaint under certain circumstances.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

NDAs can be used for some investigations carried out in the private sector. However, under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, a contract is void to the extent it retracts or restricts a person's rights under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. An NDA that restricts the right to report irregularities to authorities or the media would, therefore, typically be void.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is conducted by a prevention advisor, the investigation and the prevention advisor are bound and protected by a professional duty of confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Attorney-client privilege will apply to all communication and investigative material between a client and its law firm. Attorney-client privilege is, however, not without limitations. Regarding investigations into alleged employee misconduct, a law firm may have to report suspected money laundering to the authorities and under certain circumstances disclose information to the financial police.

Written material covered by attorney-client privilege generally may not be seized.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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).<sup>[1]</sup>

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

---

<sup>[1]</sup> 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



## 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?

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

An employee can be assisted by a member of a trade union. They are also free to consult a lawyer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employee has no right to bring legal representation. However, the outcome of an investigation may lead to employment-related consequences, so it may be appropriate (depending on the situation) to offer the employee the opportunity to bring a union representative (if the employee is unionised) or a legal representative.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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



## 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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

At the request of the involved employee, an employee can be assisted by a member of the trade union delegation, for example, during his or her hearing.

The works council should be informed of an investigation if there is a considerable impact on the company; this will only be the case if the investigation concerns a very serious, important or widespread issue. This information should be communicated as soon as possible and before measures are taken as a result of the investigation. This is only a right to information, not consultation. Moreover, members of the works council may be asked to respect their duty of confidentiality. However, as the enforcement of this duty of confidentiality is difficult, the timing of the information should be chosen wisely so it does not jeopardise the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

No, but if the employee under investigation is unionised it is appropriate to inform the union about the investigation. If the employer chooses to take action against the employee during, or after, the investigation, the trade union generally needs to be consulted before any final decisions are made.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the employer is not authorised to inform a works council or trade union about the investigation, as it may be in violation of the duty of confidentiality (see question 10).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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

## 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?

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

There are no other mandatory support measures. However, an employer is free to offer additional support, for example, by granting leave from work. If tensions at the workplace are high, it may be a good idea to ask the employee under investigation to take some leave. Some companies also provide certain legal, moral or even psychological support. If the complaint concerns sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, the prevention adviser can also recommend that the employer take additional measures to support certain employees.

Furthermore, under the whistleblower rules, an external reporting authority can grant any support measure (eg, legal advice or financial, technical, psychological or media-related, social support).

For complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, and if the facts are serious, the prevention adviser should, during the examination of the request and before giving his or her opinion to the employer, propose protective measures to the employer. These measures are necessary to avoid serious damage to the complainant's health or a significant deterioration in the situation (for example, causing opposing parties to commit criminal offences). The final decision on taking these measures rests with the employer. This means that the employer does not necessarily have to take the measures proposed by the prevention adviser. They may take other measures that provide an equivalent level of protection for the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employer is responsible for the work environment and must ensure that employees are not at risk of mental (or physical) illness due to an investigation. If an employee, in connection with an investigation, requires support or if risk of ill health is otherwise anticipated, the employer is obliged to assess the situation and provide said employee with sufficient support (eg, counselling or work adjustments).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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.<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

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

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

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?

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is not protected by confidentiality towards the employer (e.g. the prevention advisor cannot disclose confidential information to the employer), it could result in further measures taken by the employer or lead to a new investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

According to the GDPR, personal data can only be processed for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and may not be further processed in a manner that is incompatible with those purposes. This imposes restrictions on the use of material from previous investigations in new investigations when the material was collected for other purposes. It is, therefore, necessary to ensure whether the new matter relates to the investigation and falls within the purpose of the investigation. If the new matter is unrelated to the investigation and does not fall within the purpose of the investigation, the identified information may not be processed under the GDPR.

Except for what is stated above, no regulation limits how the employer can use information regarding unrelated matters. Unrelated matters may be a myriad of different things, and could in some instances just be discarded, while in other situations the information may invoke a responsibility to act for the employer (eg, if the unrelated matters concern work environment issues or other severe misconduct by an employee who is not the target of the investigation). Furthermore, the employer may always use any revealed information (unrelated or not) as evidence in a court of law, since the principle of free examination of evidence applies.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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

## 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?



### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

This will depend on where the employee raises a grievance and the content of the grievance. If it is against the employer, the investigation can take this into account and continue from there. If the grievance is raised against the authorities, it will depend on the steps taken by the authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

There are no formal rules or processes for handling grievances in Sweden. Depending on the nature of the grievance, such a complaint may also have to be investigated (unless the grievance is deemed to be trivial). This could, for example, be the case if the grievance concerns new or other work environment issues that the employer is obliged to investigate.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### 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

## 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?

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If this occurs, there is a risk that any measure resulting from the investigation (eg, a dismissal) can be (wrongly) interpreted as discrimination based on the illness of the employee. However, if the employer can prove that the measure is not related to the illness but solely related to the investigation (which is also not related to the illness), there may be no discrimination. The sickness of the employee may prevent the continuation of the investigation because, for example, it becomes impossible to hear from the employee. In this instance, the investigation can be suspended, postponed or extended until the employee returns. If it is a long-term absence, this could lead to a disproportionate amount of time to complete the investigation. Therefore, the employer should take any necessary steps to invite the ill employee to a hearing anyway (eg, through digital means). If the employee unreasonably refuses (several) of these invitations, it could be argued that the employee is wilfully boycotting the investigation and therefore forfeits his or her opportunity to be heard.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employer is responsible for the employee's work environment during the investigation. The employer must assess the situation and the impact on the employee's health and may, depending on the situation, have to postpone certain investigative measures, such as interviewing the employee in question. The investigation may even have to be completed without the employee participating.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### 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<sup>[1]</sup>. 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).

---

<sup>[1]</sup> 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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In legal proceedings, a criminal procedure takes precedence over civil procedures. However, disciplinary internal proceedings (like a workplace investigation) and an investigation by the authorities may run parallel to each other. If the public investigation leads to a court procedure that results in the acquittal of the employee under investigation, it could lead to legal problems if the employer has already imposed sanctions based on the same employee. Therefore, the employer could make the internal investigation

dependent on the public investigation, and could take preventive measures while awaiting the outcome.

The public authorities normally have the legal competence to request information that can help them in their investigation. Therefore, they could rightfully ask the employer to share evidence or findings from the internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Handling a parallel investigation will have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis depending on the applicable rules. For instance, an investigation under the Swedish Discrimination Act is subject to certain timing requirements with which the employer must comply. In other cases, it may be more appropriate to hold off the workplace investigation while awaiting the outcome of the parallel investigation.

The police or regulator can, depending on the matter at hand, request an employer to share evidence. The police or the regulator may also, under certain circumstances, retain evidence in a search.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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.



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

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

It is highly recommended to inform the employee under investigation of the outcome. If disciplinary measures are imposed upon him or her, the legal procedure must be followed and the sanction must be imposed or communicated the day after the employer or his delegate has established the wrongdoing of the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

This depends on the outcome of the investigation and the applicable rules.

If the outcome of the investigation leads to termination, the employer will have to disclose some information regarding the reason for termination. If the employee questions the termination, the employer may have to disclose more information in a subsequent dispute. If the outcome of the investigation leads to less invasive measures, such as a warning, there are less extensive requirements to provide information.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the duty of confidentiality and the restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data must be considered (see question 10). If the investigation is based on the rules in the Swedish Discrimination Act, there are also feedback requirements concerning the involved parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### 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.<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

[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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

It is recommended to limit the communication to the findings and details of the report that are necessary for the employee to fully understand the outcome. This is especially true if the investigation is bound by a duty of confidentiality (eg, under the whistleblowing rules), as the employee should not be allowed access to the full report.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

There is no obligation to share the investigation report, neither in full nor key findings, with the involved

parties. An assessment needs to be made in each case of what is appropriate to share and with whom.

When sharing an investigation report, certain data protection considerations must be made. A purpose and legal basis for the sharing must be established and, in principle, documented.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the duty of confidentiality and the restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data must be considered (see question 10).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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).<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

<sup>[1]</sup> 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



## 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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation leads to the establishment of grave errors by the employee, this can lead to sanctions. The employer must follow the procedure laid down in the internal work rules of the company and can only

impose sanctions that are included in the internal work rules. In general, these are: a verbal warning; a written warning; a suspension (remunerated or not); a fine (capped to one-fifth of daily remuneration); and dismissal. If there are very serious errors leading to an immediate inability to continue the employment relationship with the employee, the employer can dismiss the employee with urgent cause without any notice period or indemnity in lieu of notice (following the specific procedure for these types of dismissals). In less serious cases, the employer could still dismiss the employee with a notice period or indemnity in lieu of notice. In principle, the employer has a right to dismiss the employee, even if this sanction is not included in the internal work rules.

As said previously, disciplinary sanctions (included in the internal work rules) must be communicated to the sanctioned employee the day after the employer or his delegate has established fault. The sanction must be registered in a sanction register, with the name of the employee, the date, the reason and the nature of the sanction. If there is a fine, the amount of the fine should be mentioned. The proceeds of the fines must be used for the benefit of employees. Where a works council exists, the use of the proceeds of the fines must be determined after consultation with it.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

An investigation may result in employment law measures (eg, support, training, relocation, warning, termination or dismissal). An investigation may also be inconclusive and not result in any action.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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.<sup>[1]</sup>

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

---

<sup>[1]</sup> 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



## 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?**



### **Belgium**

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigated acts constitute a crime, the authorities or the police should be informed. In certain cases, not doing so could lead to the company being accused of concealing a crime or becoming jointly responsible for it. However, if the company is the only victim of the crime and it is minor, the company may choose not to inform the authorities. For example, there is an enormous difference between a bank employee stealing large amounts of money from clients and an employee who is stealing toilet paper from the company. As stated above, the interview records could be at risk of disclosure if the authorities or police seize them for their investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### **Sweden**

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Findings may have to be handed over to the police or the regulator – there is no separate legal protection for material in employer investigations related to authorities. If the investigation has been carried out by a law firm, see question 14 on attorney-client privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### **Switzerland**

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

The employer is generally not required to disclose the final report, or the data obtained in connection with the investigation. In particular, the employer is not obliged to file a criminal complaint with the police or the public prosecutor's office.

Exceptions may arise, for example, from data protection law (see question 22) or a duty to release records may arise in a subsequent state proceeding.

Data voluntarily submitted in a proceeding in connection with the internal investigation shall be considered

private opinion or party assertion.[1] If the company refuses to hand over the documents upon request, coercive measures may be used under certain circumstances.[2]

---

[1] Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio 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

## 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?

### Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

According to the GDPR, personal data should only be stored for a proportionate amount of time. Usually, this means that it can be stored as long as it is relevant for the employment contract, and even afterwards, if there is a risk of legal proceedings (ie, regarding the dismissal of the employee).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Under the GDPR personal data may not, according to the general principle on storage limitation, be retained for longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the personal data are processed. The GDPR does not stipulate a generally applicable storage limitation period. Such a regulation is, on the other hand, included in the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the outcome of the

investigation and all personal data should be retained for as long as necessary, but not for longer than two years after the investigation has been closed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

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

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

---

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

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?



## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, abusive investigations could lead to a legal claim regarding the abuse of rights. During an investigation, an employer should be guided by principles of due diligence and not take disproportionate action. If the investigation causes unnecessary damage, involved employees could file for compensation (eg, before the labour court). Next, the employer is also responsible for following the mandatory procedure for official complaints regarding sexual harassment, bullying and violence at work and investigations of whistleblower reports. In the first case, an employer who does not follow the procedure or obstructs the procedure can be liable for penal or administrative fines (maximum 8,000 euro) or, if the employer has not taken necessary measures to mitigate the risks for the employee and the employee suffers damage to their health, they may be liable for a fine of a maximum of 48,000 euro and imprisonment for between six months and three years. In the second case (whistleblower procedure), if an employer did not follow or has obstructed the procedure, they can be fined up to 5% of the annual revenue of the preceding year.

If the complaints involve allegations of sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the employer might risk an investigation of the inspection on supervision and well-being at work. If the prevention advisor finds out, before giving his advice, that the employer did not take any suitable protective measures after they were recommended, the prevention advisor is obliged to call an inspection on supervision and well-being at work.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

Errors resulting in terminations can be unlawful and, if they lead to employees terminating their employment as a result of the employer's missteps, could be seen as constructive dismissal. Constructive dismissal is generally equivalent to an unlawful dismissal. Unlawful terminations generally result in an obligation to pay financial and general damages to the affected employees.

Failure to fulfil the obligations under the Swedish Discrimination Act may lead to an obligation to pay financial and general damages.

If an employer does not fulfil its obligations according to work environment legislation, there is a risk that the Swedish Work Environment Authority will issue injunctions or prohibitions against the employer. If an employer omits to meet its work environment related obligations, and that in turn results in a work related accident, e.g. self-harm in connection with an internal investigation, it may also, in a worst case scenario, lead to criminal liability.

The Swedish Work Environment Authority is also responsible for monitoring compliance with the provisions of the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. The Swedish Work Environment Authority may, if necessary to ensure compliance with the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, order an operator to comply with the obligations and requirements of the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. Employers violating the Swedish Whistleblowing Act may also be liable to pay damages to the affected employees.

If personal data is processed in a way that violates the GDPR, the authorised supervisory authority may issue warnings or reprimands to the data controller, order the controller to comply with the GDPR, impose a ban on processing, or impose an administrative fine on the controller. Companies violating the GDPR may also be liable to pay damages to data subjects.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland



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



## United States

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



### Belgium

Nicolas Simon  
*Van Olmen & Wynant*



### Sweden

Henric Diefke  
Tobias Normann  
Alexandra Baron  
*Mannheimer Swartling*



### Switzerland

Laura Widmer  
Sandra Schaffner  
*Bär & Karrer*



### United States

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