Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

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



France

Author: Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei at Bredin Prat

Within the context of an investigation following a whistleblower alert, any violation of the confidentiality obligation is punishable by two years' imprisonment and a €30,000 fine.

If the employer fails to comply with its obligation to protect its employees' safety, the employer will be liable for damages resulting from any failings during the investigation (eg, if sexual harassment is reported and no action is taken by the employer)

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Netherlands

Author: *Barbara Kloppert*, *Mirjam Kerkhof*, *Roel de Jong* at De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek

The employee can request compensation for violation of the right to a fair hearing or reputational damage. If the employee is suspended during the investigation, , the employee can request the court to order the employer to allow them to resume their work and request rehabilitation.

In termination proceedings (or after the termination of the employment agreement by the employer), the employee can claim an equitable compensation from the employer if the employer has shown serious culpable behaviour. Such compensation, if granted, is usually based on loss of income by the employee due to the behaviour of the employer.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



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

Contributors



France

Pascale Lagesse Valentino Armillei *Bredin Prat*



Barbara Kloppert Mirjam Kerkhof Roel de Jong *De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek*



Laura Widmer Sandra Schaffner *Bär & Karrer*

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com