

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?

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



Thailand

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

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

The LPA requires any employer having ten or more employees to prepare work rules in the Thai language and the work rules require an employer to prescribe a procedure for the submission of grievances that would normally include the process for investigations in the workplace. Therefore, the work rules are the main guidance and policy that govern a workplace investigation. In some cases, an employer may have a

whistleblowing policy allowing whistle-blowers to submit complaints of illegal or improper activities to the employer. The whistleblowing policy will also prescribe the procedures for investigating in workplace reflecting the complaints submitted by whistle-blowers.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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*
at Bär & Karrer

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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^[1], if the allegations concerned are quite substantive and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

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

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

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

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

The appropriate investigator should be able to investigate objectively without bias (ie, the investigator cannot have a stake in the outcome, a personal relationship with the involved parties and the outcome of

the investigation should not directly affect the investigator's position within the organisation); has skills that include prior investigative knowledge and a working knowledge of employment laws; has strong interpersonal skills to build a rapport with the parties involved and to be perceived as neutral and fair; is detail-oriented; has the right temperament to conduct interviews; can be trusted to maintain confidentiality; is respected within the organisation; and can act as a credible witness.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Thailand

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

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

process of the employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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.^[1]

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

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.^[1] The factual connection with the employment relationship is given, for example, in the case of a criminal act committed during working hours or using workplace infrastructure.^[2]

^[1] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 168.

^[2] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 168 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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.



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



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



Switzerland

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

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

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

In return for the employer's duty of care, employees must comply with their duty of loyalty and safeguard the employer's legitimate interests. In connection with an internal investigation, employees must therefore keep the conduct of an investigation confidential. Additionally, employees must keep confidential and not disclose to any third party any facts that they have acquired in the course of the employment relationship, and which are neither obvious nor publicly accessible.[\[3\]](#)

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

Unless the investigation is handled by a qualified professional (eg, attorney or auditor) where certain privileges apply, confidentiality obligations are generally subject to the contractual arrangement between

the parties involved in the investigation. The employers need to inform any persons, including the investigators, to respect confidentiality obligations because a leak of the information gathered from the investigations could cause damage to relevant parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

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

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

employee, it should be shown to the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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' interests to be presented with the relevant documents or statements (see question 11; see also article 9 paragraphs 1 and 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). However, a careful assessment of interests is required, and these must be limited to what is necessary. In principle, a person accusing another person must take responsibility for their information and accept criticism from the person implicated by the information provided.[\[1\]](#)

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

13. Can non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) be used to keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential?



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



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

This is a fact-specific inquiry that depends on the specific circumstances and laws of the relevant state. In general, NDAs are frowned upon but can be used to an extent to keep certain facts and the substance of an investigation confidential. NDAs can never prevent employees from assisting in official agency investigations, however. NDAs also cannot lawfully prohibit employees from officially reporting illegal conduct by their employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



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).^[1]

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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?



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

Thailand

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

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

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?



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.^[1] These third parties will need to sign separate non-disclosure agreements before being involved in the internal investigation.

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

regulatory investigation?



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



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

investigation while cooperating with police or regulatory investigators.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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).^[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.^[2]

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



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.^[1]

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

Where the misconduct alleged is substantiated in whole or in part by an internal investigation, the human

resources function, potentially in consultation with in-house or outside counsel, should agree on disciplinary or remedial action to be implemented.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

25. Who can (or must) the investigation findings be disclosed to? Does that include regulators/police? Can the interview records be kept private, or are they at risk of disclosure?



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



Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*

at Chandler MHM

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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).^[1]

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unlawful action by the employer may also have consequences on future criminal proceedings: The prohibitions on exploitation (article 140 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) apply a priori only to

evidence obtained directly from public authorities. Evidence obtained unlawfully by private persons (ie, the employer) may also be used if it could have been lawfully obtained by the authority and if the interest in establishing the truth outweighs the interest of the individual in not using the evidence.^[5] Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code remains reserved: Evidence obtained in violation of Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code is subject to an absolute ban on the use of evidence (e.g. evidence obtained under the use of torture^[6]).^[7]

^[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

^[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Thailand

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United States

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

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

The employer should also maintain a clear record of the steps taken to investigate the alleged misconduct

and any findings, as well as all evidence gathered during the investigation, including documents collected and reviewed, any work done to identify systemic issues or patterns of behaviour, and notes from all interviews, which should be limited to the facts gathered, dated and should indicate the duration and location of the interview.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Sweden

Henric Diefke
Tobias Normann
Alexandra Baron
Mannheimer Swartling



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



Thailand

Ratthai Kamolwarin
Norrapat Werajong
Chandler MHM



United States

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