

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

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

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

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

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



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

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



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



United States

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

