

# 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?



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

While there are no specific laws that regulate a workplace investigation, there are several laws that companies should consider when conducting a workplace investigation concerning alleged employee misconduct.

One key example is the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA). The WPA provides legal protection to a whistleblower if their allegations are raised in good faith and are in the public interest as specified under the WPA. If the WPA applies, certain obligations apply to the company, including but not limited to the following:

- the obligation to protect the confidentiality of the whistleblower's identity;
- protecting the whistleblower if the whistleblower suffers or is likely to suffer serious harm to life or health as a result of whistleblowing and the whistleblower requests protection; and
- refraining from taking retaliatory action on the whistleblower.

Therefore, if an employee raises allegations of another employee's misconduct, the company should review whether the allegations fall under the WPA.

There are also special laws that impose obligations on the company if there are certain types of allegations (eg, sexual harassment, workplace harassment).

In addition, when collecting and reviewing employees' electronic data, such as emails or files stored in work laptops or company servers, which may contain personal information, the company should comply with data privacy laws discussed in more detail in questions 7 and 8.

Companies may also have internal policies (eg, whistleblower protection policies, Code of Conduct) that may apply to workplace investigations, aside from the requirements under Korean law.

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

## 02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There are many different ways a workplace investigation concerning employee misconduct could commence. Below are some key examples from our experience:

- an employee reports allegations concerning another employee's misconduct through an ethics hotline or other means (eg, email, phone call);
- an outsider such as a former employee or a vendor reports allegations concerning employee misconduct to a company officer;
- an internal audit reveals potential employee misconduct;
- media reports raise allegations of employee misconduct; and
- an external investigation begins (eg, by criminal authorities or administrative agencies) concerning alleged employee misconduct.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Switzerland

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

Internal investigations are usually initiated after reports about possible violations of the employer's code of conduct, applicable laws or regulations have been submitted by employees to their superiors, the human resources department or designated internal reporting systems such as hotlines (including whistleblowing hotlines).

For an internal investigation to be initiated, there must be a reasonable suspicion (grounds).<sup>[1]</sup> If no such grounds exist, the employer must ask the informant for further or more specific information. If no grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the case must be closed. If grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the appropriate investigative steps can be initiated by a formal investigation request from the company management.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute*

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



#### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

The company may place an employee who is subject to a workplace investigation under administrative leave if this seems necessary or appropriate to ensure the integrity of the workplace investigation. While administrative leave can take different forms, one way is to issue a “standby order” to the relevant employee, instructing him or her not to come into work and prohibiting contact with other employees or customers while the workplace investigation is ongoing.

Administrative leave is not a disciplinary action, but rather an exercise of the company’s authority to take personnel management measures. This authority is generally subject to a “reasonableness” test, with the Korean courts balancing the employer’s business necessity in placing the employee on administrative leave with the inconvenience caused to the employee. In conducting the balancing test, the Korean courts have considered whether the employee receives pay during the leave and the duration of the leave, among other things. In general, if the duration of the leave is not excessive and is with full pay and benefits, the employer’s management prerogative is likely to be recognised.

The company doesn’t need to obtain the employee’s consent but, in practice, a company should consider getting the employee’s acknowledgement that they have received the administrative leave notice.

In addition to Korean labour law, other factors such as the company’s rules of employment or a collective bargaining agreement (if any) may affect the company’s ability to place the employee on administrative leave, by providing for prescribed procedures for placing an employee on administrative leave or requiring the company to obtain the union’s consent if a union leader or executive is involved.

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.

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

While there are no laws that set minimum qualifications for who should conduct a workplace investigation, companies often engage external legal counsel to ensure the investigation is conducted in an unbiased and professional manner. If the company itself undertakes the workplace investigation, the company should take precautions such as ensuring that the person conducting the investigation is not biased and not involved in the alleged wrongdoing. If the person conducting the investigation cannot converse in the native language of the employee under investigation, the company may consider arranging for an interpreter when conducting interviews, to minimise the risk of misunderstanding.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Switzerland

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

The examinations can be carried out internally by designated internal employees, by external specialists, or by a combination thereof. The addition of external advisors is particularly recommended if the allegations are against an employee of a high hierarchical level<sup>[1]</sup>, if the allegations concerned are quite substantive and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

---

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

An employee under investigation cannot bring legal action (eg, an injunction) to stop a workplace investigation. However, there have been instances where an employee under investigation raised legal challenges concerning the investigation (eg, breach of privacy). Please see question 19. While the company

would not be legally compelled to stop the investigation when legal challenges are raised, they may face penalties under the relevant laws if it is determined they have committed a violation.

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

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



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

While there are no laws to compel co-workers to act as witnesses, the company may have internal policies (eg, rules of employment, code of conduct) that require employees to cooperate with company actions such as a workplace investigation. That said, it would be difficult to enforce such policies even if the employee refuses to cooperate (eg, taking disciplinary action against an employee who refuses to act as a witness).

There may be instances when the company is required to provide certain legal protection to employees acting as witnesses in an investigation. For example, if a whistleblower falling under the WPA is required to act as a witness, they would be entitled to legal protections as discussed in question 1. The company may also have internal policies that provide protection to employees acting as witnesses in an investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

Due to the employee's duty of loyalty towards the employer and the employer's right to give instructions to its employees, employees generally must take part in an ongoing investigation and comply with any summons for questioning if the employer demands this (article 321d, Swiss Code of Obligations). If the employees refuse to participate, they generally are in breach of their statutory duties, which may lead to measures such as a termination of employment.

The question of whether employees may refuse to testify if they would have to incriminate themselves is disputed in legal doctrine.<sup>[1]</sup> However, according to legal doctrine, a right to refuse to testify exists if

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

It may be difficult for a company to search and collect physical items that personally belong to the employee.

While the company may search and gather electronic data, such as emails or files stored in work laptops or company servers, there are requirements and restrictions under the Criminal Code, the Personal Information Protection Act (PIPA), and the Act on Promotion of Information and Communications Network Utilisation and Information Protection, etc (Network Act), among other laws.

Article 316(2) of the Criminal Code states that accessing the contents of another person's documents, pictures, special media records, etc, that are sealed or designated as secret using technical means may constitute the crime of accessing electronic records.

Under the PIPA, consent must be obtained from the information owner to collect or use personal information, or to provide such information to a third party. Consent must be separately obtained for sensitive information or unique identification information. There are strict requirements as to the format and contents of the consent forms under the PIPA.

The Network Act prohibits accessing an information and communications network without rightful authority or any intrusion that goes beyond the permitted authority for access. Although this may not be an issue if a company directly manages the email accounts at issue, if an employee's email account is protected by a password or through other means, accessing emails from that account without obtaining the employee's consent could constitute unlawful intrusion under the Network Act as well as under the Criminal Code as discussed above.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

The Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection applies to the gathering of evidence, in particular such collection must be lawful, transparent, reasonable and in good faith, and data security must be preserved.<sup>[1]</sup>

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

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

---

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

As discussed in question 7, it may be difficult for a company to search an employee's personal possessions. The company may search and gather electronic data stored in work laptops or company servers, subject to legal requirements and restrictions (eg, obtaining consent).

The PIPA provides specific guidance on the requirements for obtaining consent. Under the PIPA, to collect or use an individual's personal information, the information holder must be informed of and consent to:

- the purpose of the collection or use;
- the personal information that will be collected;
- the period of retention and use; and
- his or her right to refuse to provide consent and any disadvantages that may result from such refusal.

There are separate requirements for obtaining consent to provide an individual's personal information to a third party. Also, consent must be obtained separately for the collection, use or provision of sensitive or unique identification information.

Under limited circumstances, personal information may be collected, used, or provided to third parties without obtaining the consent of the information holder. For instance, a company may collect and use personal information without obtaining consent where obtaining the information is necessary to achieve the company's "legitimate interests", which clearly exceed the information holder's right to his or her personal

information, and the collection and use are carried out within reasonable bounds. The term “legitimate interests” in this context is generally understood as a concept similar to “justifiable act” under the Criminal Code. The Korean Supreme Court has held that under exceptional circumstances such as the following, the company’s collection and review of employee data may constitute a “justifiable act” under the Criminal Code:

1. the company had specific and reasonable suspicion that the employee had committed a crime and the company had an urgent need to verify the facts;
2. the scope of the company’s review was limited to the suspected crime through the use of keywords, etc;
3. the employee had signed an agreement stating that he or she would not use work computers in an unauthorised manner and that all work products would belong to the company; and
4. the company’s review uncovered materials that could be used to verify whether the employee committed the alleged crime.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

The basic rule is that the employer may not search private data during internal investigations.

If there is a strong suspicion of criminal conduct on the part of the employee and a sufficiently strong justification exists, a search of private data may be justified.<sup>[1]</sup> The factual connection with the employment relationship is given, for example, in the case of a criminal act committed during working hours or using workplace infrastructure.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

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

<sup>[2]</sup> 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

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



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

Aside from the legal obligations imposed on the company when dealing with a whistleblower who is subject to the WPA as discussed in question 1, there are also practical considerations the company should keep in mind when dealing with a whistleblower, regardless of whether the whistleblower falls under the WPA.

For example, there have been instances where an employee who raised allegations filed a complaint with Korean authorities (such as the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) or the Labour Office)



that the company took retaliatory action against the whistleblower. The company should carefully review the legal risks before taking action, such as personnel action or civil or criminal action, against an employee who raises allegations if that employee was also involved in the wrongdoing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

If an employee complains to his or her superiors about grievances or misconduct in the workplace and is subsequently dismissed, this may constitute an unlawful termination (article 336, Swiss Code of Obligations). However, the prerequisite for this is that the employee behaves in good faith, which is not the case if he or she is (partly) responsible for the grievance.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

# 10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

It is general practice in Korea for a company to require interviewees to maintain confidentiality concerning a workplace investigation and instruct them that they are not permitted to discuss the matter under investigation with other employees, etc. If an employee violates this instruction, it may be possible for the company to take disciplinary action against them under the company's rules.

Further, the company or its employees who have engaged in an investigation for sexual harassment or workplace harassment in the workplace are obliged to maintain the confidentiality of the investigation. Failure to comply with such requirements may lead to an administrative fine from the Ministry of Employment and Labour for the company or its registered representative.

There may be some exceptions to the confidentiality obligation, such as when an employee is required by government authorities to provide relevant information in a parallel investigation.

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

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is no requirement to notify an employee under investigation concerning the allegations against him or her when requesting cooperation with a workplace investigation (eg, requesting the employee's consent to review electronic data, or requesting an interview).

However, the company may strategically consider explaining the general purpose of the investigation before requesting consent to review electronic data or when requesting an interview. This may help increase the likelihood of cooperation and also reduce the risk of the employee raising objections to the company's findings from the investigation by saying he or she was not properly informed of the purpose of the investigation, or that the investigation was conducted in a coercive manner.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Switzerland

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

As a result of the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), employees under investigation have certain procedural rights. These include, in principle, the right of the accused to be heard. In this context, the accused has the right to be informed at the beginning of the questioning about

the subject of the investigation and at least the main allegations and they must be allowed to share their view and provide exculpatory evidence.[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

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

As discussed in question 1, if the whistleblower falls under the WPA, the whistleblower's identity should be kept confidential. Even if the WPA does not apply, the company may wish to keep the identity of the

whistleblower and other key witnesses confidential to the greatest extent possible.

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

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

### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

Some companies require an employee subject to investigation to sign an NDA or other similar documents (eg, a pledge of confidentiality) agreeing not to disclose information relating to the investigation to outside parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

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

## 14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

No law recognises the common law concept of “attorney-client privilege” in Korea. However, communication with an attorney is protected to some extent under certain laws, such as the Constitution, the Attorney Act, the Criminal Procedure Act, and the Civil Procedure Act. This protection is based on the attorney’s confidentiality obligation, which prohibits an attorney from divulging confidential matters acquired in the course of representing clients, unless otherwise prescribed by law. This confidentiality obligation generally allows an attorney to refuse to testify or comply with document production orders for information or materials the attorney obtained in the course of his or her duties that relate to the confidential information of clients.

In addition, there could be instances where materials from an investigation conducted in Korea may become subject to discovery outside of Korea. It is, therefore, important to ensure investigation materials are privileged under the relevant non-Korean laws in the jurisdictions where attorney-client privilege is recognised (eg, the US).

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.

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?



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

While the company cannot prevent an employee from engaging his or her legal counsel, there is no legal obligation for a company to allow an employee to bring his or her legal counsel to an interview, for example. If the employee expresses his or her intention not to participate in the interview session without his or her legal counsel, the company may consider explaining to the employee that such refusal to participate in the interview may constitute a breach of reasonable work-related orders and may be subject to disciplinary action. However, the company should consider the possibility of the employee claiming that he or she was not given a proper opportunity to explain the allegations during the investigation because they were prevented from obtaining legal assistance.

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

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

While a labour union does not have a legal right under Korean law to be informed or involved in the investigation, unless otherwise required under the relevant collective bargaining agreement, there have been instances where the labour union raised complaints that the company did not properly investigate an employee, who is a member of the labour union, particularly if the company took disciplinary action against that employee based on the findings of the investigation. The company should consider such a practical risk when conducting a workplace investigation.

If the investigation was conducted based on a claim filed by an employee to the Grievance Handling Committee (which is a sub-committee of a works council), the members of that committee have a right to be informed of the results of the investigation.

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

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*

at Kim & Chang

There could be some instances where an employee involved in an investigation may be entitled to support from the company. To give an example, there have been some cases where a whistleblower claimed they suffered workplace harassment or their employer took retaliatory action (eg, wrongful transfer) and they sought damages or other relief.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

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

The employer does not generally need to provide specific support for employees that are subject to an internal investigation. The employer may, however, allow concerned employees to be accompanied by a trusted third party such as family members or friends.<sup>[1]</sup> These third parties will need to sign separate non-disclosure agreements before being involved in the internal investigation.

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

---

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

Sometimes, the company discovers other potential misconduct in addition to the specific allegations that trigger a workplace investigation. No law limits the scope of the company's investigation to the allegations that were initially raised.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*



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

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

It is not uncommon for an employee under investigation to raise grievances during or after the investigation. Below are some examples of claims an employee may raise:

- that the company reviewed the employee's electronic data without obtaining the requisite consent;
- that witnesses or the company committed defamation in violation of the Criminal Code;
- that the employee was coerced to comply with the investigation in violation of the Criminal Code;
- that the employee was disciplined without just cause; or
- that the employee was harassed by other employees for providing information during the investigation.

The actions the company should take would vary depending on the grievance raised.

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

## 20. What if the employee under investigation goes off

# sick during the investigation?



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

The company should review whether the employee under investigation is requesting sick leave under appropriate procedures and for a legitimate reason and may consider ways to persuade the employee to cooperate with the investigation. If the employee applies for sick leave following company policy, the company would need to grant such sick leave and suspend the investigation during the sick leave.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Switzerland

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

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

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

---

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 21. How do you handle a parallel criminal and/or regulatory investigation?



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is no obligation to stay the workplace investigation while the parallel criminal or regulatory investigation is being conducted. In practice, companies often proceed with, or even accelerate, the workplace investigation to find out the facts and defend themselves against the parallel criminal or regulatory investigation being conducted. The company should be careful not to engage in activities that may raise suspicions as to whether the company is impeding the government investigation or concealing or destroying evidence.

While the investigation report would typically not be privileged, the company may consider explaining to the authorities that the investigation findings are not conclusive, should the police or regulator request the internal investigation report.

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

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

### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is no legal obligation for a company to disclose the outcome of an investigation to the employee who was subject to it. Having said that, if the company wishes to take disciplinary action against the employee based on the outcome of an investigation, it is required to disclose sufficient detail on the employee's wrongdoing that is subject to disciplinary action. This information should be provided to the employee before the disciplinary action committee (DAC) hearing to provide the employee with sufficient time to present and defend his or her position during the DAC hearing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

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

Workplace investigations often result in an investigation report that is intended to serve as the basis for any measures to be taken by the company's decisionmakers.

The employee's right to information based on article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection also covers the investigation report, provided that the report and the data contained therein relate to the employee.<sup>[1]</sup> In principle, the employee concerned is entitled to receive a written copy of the entire investigation report free of charge (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 et seq, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection). Redactions may be made where the interests of the company or third parties so require, but they are the exception and must be kept to a minimum.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

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

[2] Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 394.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

As discussed in question 22, when taking disciplinary action against an employee based on the outcome of an investigation, the company would need to disclose sufficient detail on the employee's wrongdoing. However, this does not mean that the full investigation report would need to be shared with the employee to be disciplined. Key details of the investigation findings that apply to the relevant employee due to be disciplined should be shared, and not other findings concerning other persons.

There is also no requirement under Korean law for a company to disclose the investigation report or investigation findings to the whistleblower. If the company discloses the personal identity of the target employees, such disclosure could constitute a violation of the PIPA, libel or defamation under the Criminal Code. If the whistleblower strongly requests that the company share the investigation report or the findings, the company may consider providing a summary of the key findings concerning the allegations that the whistleblower raised, without disclosing personal information.

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).

## 24. What next steps are available to the employer?



### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

After completing an investigation, the company may consider the following measures, among others:

1. taking disciplinary action against the relevant employees;
2. taking legal action (eg, criminal action, civil action) against the relevant employees; and
3. taking appropriate remedial measures (eg, strengthening existing policies and establishing new policies, and conducting training).

The company may also consider making a voluntary report to the relevant authorities as discussed in question 25.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### Switzerland

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

If the investigation uncovers misconduct, the question arises as to what steps should be taken. Of course, the severity of the misconduct and the damage caused play a significant role. Furthermore, it must be noted that the cooperation of the employee concerned may be of decisive importance for the outcome of the investigation. The possibilities are numerous, ranging, for example, from preventive measures to criminal complaints.<sup>[1]</sup>

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

---

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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?



## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is generally no obligation to report violations to the Korean authorities, subject to limited exceptions (eg, financial institutions are required to report certain types of wrongdoing to the financial regulator; if there was a leak of an industrial technology developed through a national research and development project or a national core technology, this leak should be reported to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy and the National Intelligence Service). However, even in the absence of a self-reporting obligation, the company may consider strategically deciding to make a voluntary report. For example, there have been instances where the police or prosecutors' investigations were conducted in a more limited manner where the company filed a voluntary report and cooperated with the investigation. Also, for certain types of violations (eg, cartel activities), self-reporting to the relevant authority may entitle the company to leniency provided under the law.

In certain instances, the company may also consider reporting violations to the relevant foreign authorities, in addition to, or instead of, the Korean authorities. For example, if the company found potential violations of US law such as sanctions law or the Foreign Corrupt Practice Act, the company may want to self-report these violations to the relevant authorities such as the Office of Foreign Assets Control, or the US Department of Justice.

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.<sup>[1]</sup> If the company refuses to hand over the documents upon request, coercive measures may be used under certain circumstances.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio Romerio/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), *Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen*, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 123.

<sup>[2]</sup> Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio Romerio/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), *Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen*, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 102 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



South Korea

## South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is no legal requirement on how long the records of the investigation (eg disciplinary action) should be maintained by the company. Many companies maintain a record of disciplinary action throughout the employment period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Switzerland

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

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

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

---

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

As mentioned in question 19, employees may potentially raise claims, such as that the company violated data privacy laws in reviewing employee data, committed defamation, coerced the employee to comply with the investigation, and that witnesses or the company committed defamation in violation of the Criminal Code or disciplined the employee without just cause.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Switzerland

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

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

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

Unlawful action by the employer may also have consequences on future criminal proceedings: The prohibitions on exploitation (article 140 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) apply a priori only to evidence obtained directly from public authorities. Evidence obtained unlawfully by private persons (ie, the employer) may also be used if it could have been lawfully obtained by the authority and if the interest in establishing the truth outweighs the interest of the individual in not using the evidence.[5] Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code remains reserved: Evidence obtained in violation of Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code is subject to an absolute ban on the use of evidence (e.g. evidence obtained under the use of torture[6]).[7]

---

[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

[5] Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 6B\_1241/2016 dated 17. July 2017 consid. 1.2.2; Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 1B\_22/2012 dated 11 May 2012 consid. 2.4.4.

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Contributors



South Korea

Hyunjae Park  
Paul Cho



Jihay Ellie Kwack  
Kyson Keebong Paek  
*Kim & Chang*



## Switzerland

Laura Widmer  
Sandra Schaffner  
*Bär & Karrer*

[www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com](http://www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com)