

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

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

Germany

Author: *Hendrik Bockenheimer, Susanne Walzer, Musa Müjdecı*
at Hengeler Mueller

Since there is no mandatory law (yet) that provides a framework for workplace investigation interviews, there are also no special protective regulations for employees acting as witnesses.

Employees have a contractual duty to participate in interviews – be it as a suspect or as a witness – as part of workplace investigations. The employee must provide truthful information based on his duty of loyalty if:

- the questions relate to his area of work;
- the employer has an interest worthy of protection in obtaining the information; and
- the requested information does not represent an excessive burden for the employee.

Whether such a burden can be assumed when the employee must make statements by which he may incriminate himself is disputed in German case law and legal literature. The German Federal Labour Court has not yet decided on this question. Since an internal workplace investigation interview is an interview under private law and not under criminal law, there are, in our view, good arguments that the employee must also make a true statement even if he incriminates himself, provided his area of work is concerned. However, some labour courts assume that in these cases such a statement could not be used in criminal proceedings.

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](https://www.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](https://www.hrtoday.ch), last visited on 17 June 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Germany

Author: *Hendrik Bockenheimer, Susanne Walzer, Musa Müjdecı*
at Hengeler Mueller

When collecting data (in physical or digital form), the employer must ensure compliance with the data protection principles according to the General Data Protection Regulation (DSGVO) and the German Data Protection Act (BDSG). These principles include, among other things, that data collection must be carried out lawfully (principle of legality) and transparently (transparency principle) and must be comprehensively documented – specifically concerning the purpose of the workplace investigation – to be able to prove compliance with data protection.

The principle of legality states that data may only be collected on a legal basis (ie, there must either be a law authorising this or the employee must have consented to the collection of his data).

The transparency principle may constitute a special challenge during workplace investigations. Under the transparency principle, the employee must be generally informed about the collection of his data. This includes information on who processes the data, the purposes for which it is processed and whether the data is made available to third parties. However, there may be a risk of collusion, particularly when electronic data has to be reviewed, and thus the success of the investigation may be jeopardised if the relevant employee is comprehensively informed in advance. Accordingly, the employer should check, with the assistance of the data protection officer, whether the obligation to provide information may be dispensed with. This may be the case if providing the information would impair the assertion, exercise or defence of legal claims and the interests of the employer in not providing the information outweigh the interests of the employee. The respective circumstances and employer's considerations should be well documented in each case.

Regardless of whether the employee is informed about the investigation, to prevent data loss, the employee should be sent a so-called hold notice (ie, a prohibition to delete data). Additionally, to prevent automatic deletion, blocking mechanisms should also be implemented.

When gathering evidence by searching the employee's possessions or files, the employee's privacy rights also need to be observed (see question 8).

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

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



Germany

Author: *Hendrik Bockenheimer, Susanne Walzer, Musa Müjdecı*
at Hengeler Mueller

Generally, when employees may also use their devices for private purposes, the employer should ensure it allows its employees to tag their private data as "private". This tagging may facilitate the differentiation between business data (relevant for the investigation) and (non-usable) private data in the event of e-mail and electronic data screening.

In addition, the employer may, in appropriate cases, assure the employee that, if there is complete and truthful disclosure of facts to be clarified, the employer will refrain from imposing sanctions under labour and civil law (eg, a warning, termination of employment and the assertion of any claims for damages). In practice, assistance in finding a lawyer and the payment of legal fees is sometimes offered. However, such

amnesty programmes are commonly only useful if there is a large number of cases that are particularly complex, poorly documented and difficult to resolve without amnesty offers.

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

Contributors



Germany

Hendrik Bockenheimer
Susanne Walzer
Musa Müjdecı
Hengeler Mueller



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer