

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?

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Before commencing a workplace investigation, an employer must review the terms of any applicable employment contract, policy, procedure or industrial instrument. These documents will likely contain clauses that will dictate the investigation process.

There is also a significant body of common law that dictates how an investigation should be conducted and the procedural fairness that should be afforded to those involved. To ensure a workplace investigation is procedurally fair, employers must consider several factors, including:

- putting all allegations to the respondent in a manner which does not suggest a pre-determination of the outcome;
- conducting the investigation in a timely manner;
- providing the respondent with the opportunity to respond to the allegations;
- conducting a fair investigation process;
- making an unbiased (and not pre-determined) decision; and
- permitting the respondent and complainant to involve a support person or union representative.

Employers should also consider the additional steps they can take to conduct a best-practice investigation, including:

- being thorough and taking the time to plan the investigation;
- communicating clearly and fairly;
- considering whether the allegations are indicative of a wider workplace behaviour problem;
- maintaining confidentiality; and
- preventing victimisation.

Last updated on 25/09/2023

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*

at Ogier

In Ireland, employees have a constitutional right and an implied contractual right to natural justice and fair procedures. If a workplace investigation is not conducted in accordance with these principles, an employee may allege that the investigation is fundamentally flawed. If such an allegation is made then an employee may seek recourse from the Workplace Relations Commission (WRC) or potentially the High Court. The WRC is the body in Ireland tasked with dealing with employment law-related claims, including unfair dismissal.

The constitutional rights that employees enjoy were specified in the Supreme Court case of *Re Haughey* in 1971. That case held that where proceedings may harm the reputation of a person, public bodies must afford certain basic protections of constitutional justice to a witness appearing before it. It further stated that article 40.3 of the Irish Constitution is a guarantee to the citizen of basic fairness of procedures. These protections, known as “*Re Haughey rights*” are implied in each contract of employment.

A Code of Practice was introduced in 2000, namely S.I. No. 146/2000 - Industrial Relations Act, 1990 (Code of Practice on Grievance and Disciplinary Procedures) (Declaration) Order, 2000 (the Code). The Code set out the procedures for dealing with grievances or disciplinary matters, which must comply with the general principles of natural justice and fair procedures and include:

- that employee grievances are fairly examined and processed;
- that details of any allegations or complaints are put to the employee concerned;
- that the employee concerned is allowed to respond fully to any such allegations or complaints;
- that the employee concerned is given the opportunity to avail of the right to be represented during the procedure; and
- that the employee concerned has the right to a fair and impartial determination of the issues concerned, taking into account any representations made by, or on behalf of, the employee and any other relevant or appropriate evidence, factors or circumstances.

Further Codes of Practice on the prevention and resolution of bullying at work and on dealing with sexual harassment and harassment at work were published in 2021 and 2022, respectively. The provisions of these codes are admissible in evidence before a court, the WRC and the Labour Court.

In addition to the above, the Data Protection Commission published Data Protection in the Workplace: Employer Guidance in April 2023.

All employers should have specific and up-to-date policies dealing with how workplace investigations will be carried out that are suitable for their organisation. These policies may vary, depending on the subject of the investigation and the size and type of employer. However, all should adhere to the principles identified above to ensure that a robust policy is in place and can be utilised.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

A workplace investigation will generally be triggered by an employee making a complaint; however, issues may also be brought to the attention of an employer through an anonymous tip, by suppliers or contractors, from customers or because of observations and hearsay.

Complaints can be made directly to Human Resources (HR), anonymously, by email to a line manager or a third party. While complaints do not need to be written and can be informal, brief or verbal, complaints of this nature can make the process harder and more information may be required.

The receipt of a complaint does not necessarily mean that an employer needs to undertake an investigation immediately. A grievance policy ordinarily contains a multi-step approach to dealing with complaints, starting with internal resolution options such as informal discussions, conciliation and mediation. However, an investigation should be commenced where:

- the complaint alleges serious misconduct or unlawful conduct;
- the employer is required to conduct a workplace investigation as per an employment contract, policy, procedure or industrial instrument; or
- the complaint is complex and requires clarity on what has occurred to establish the facts.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Investigations can start in multiple ways. They usually stem from an employee raising a grievance, a bullying complaint, or a possible protected disclosure. Investigations may also stem from the employer in a

disciplinary context, or indeed can be commenced if an external complaint or issue is raised by a third party of the organisation.

The first thing the employer must consider is whether an investigation is necessary. It may be that the issue at hand can be resolved informally or is of such a nature that it cannot be investigated, either through a lack of detail or simply because the subject of the complaint is no longer an employee. Any such decision to investigate or not should be carefully documented.

The next step to determine is the nature of the investigation. It should be clear at the outset whether the investigation is simply a fact-gathering exercise or if the investigator will be tasked with making findings on the evidence. The distinction is significant as a fact-gathering investigation can proceed without prompting the full panoply of rights, but the basic principles of fairness should still be applied. A fact-gathering investigation should determine whether there is or is not, a case to answer. If a disciplinary hearing follows then the rights outlined in question 1 will apply at that stage. If it is a fact-finding investigation, the rights apply from the outset of the process. The employee who is required to respond to the issues (the respondent) should be fully aware of the extent of the investigation. The investigator appointed to do the investigation should be clear about what is expected of them.

If the employer believes an investigation is necessary, it should be acknowledged and started without delay. In particular, according to the Protected Disclosures legislation, a report should be acknowledged within seven days.

An employer should consider and identify the scope of the investigation and establish who will investigate the matter. Terms of reference under which the investigation will be carried out should be established by the employer and shared with the employee raising the issue (the complainant). An employer should not seek agreement on the terms, but invite commentary to ensure that the full scope of the investigation is captured within the terms of reference. Robust terms of reference that lay down the clear parameters of the investigation will assist the investigator and all parties involved in the process.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

It is an important consideration as to whether any of the employees involved in the investigation should be suspended, stood down or asked to undertake alternative duties for the period of the investigation. This decision will need to be made taking into consideration the nature of the complaint, any further damage to workplace relationships that could be caused by employees continuing to interact with each other, and potential work, health and safety issues.

It should not be automatic that the respondent is suspended as the employer will need to consider whether this is necessary in the circumstances. However, a period of suspension should be considered where:

- the allegations involve serious misconduct;
- there is a risk that the conduct will continue throughout the investigation;
- the respondent's presence could exacerbate the situation; or
- the respondent's presence could be disruptive to the investigation.

As an alternative to suspension, other options include working from home, performing amended duties or moving to a different workspace.

If an employee is suspended then they should ordinarily receive their full pay for this period. There are some exceptions to this, for example, if the employee is a casual employee or if a policy, employment contract or other industrial instrument allows the employee to be suspended without pay.

Generally, there is no minimum or maximum period a suspension should last, as this will depend on the length of the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*

at Ogier

Workplace suspensions in Ireland are a contentious issue and can result in an employer defending injunction proceedings in the High Court before an investigation has started.

In the case of *Governor and Company of the Bank of Ireland v Reilly*, the judge stated: "The suspension of an employee, whether paid or unpaid, is an extremely serious measure which can cause irreparable damage to his or her reputation and standing."

In the 2023 case of *O'Sullivan v HSE*, the Supreme Court held that the Health Service Executive acted fairly and reasonably as an employer in suspending a consultant doctor after he had performed experiments on patients without their consent. This ruling overturned the Court of Appeal's earlier decision that previously found the suspension to be unlawful, as the consultant did not represent an immediate threat to the health of patients.

The Supreme Court considered whether the employer's decision to place the consultant on administrative leave met the test set out in the English case of *Braganza v BP Shipping Limited & Anor*. In that case, the court held that the decisionmaker's discretion would be limited "by concepts of good faith, honesty and genuineness and the need for absence of arbitrariness, capriciousness, perversity and irrationality."

In relying on the principles set out in the *Braganza* case, the Irish courts have reinforced the right of a decision-maker in an employment context to have discretionary power when implementing a suspension and that any decision to do so must be made honestly and in good faith. Employers should obtain legal advice when considering whether to suspend an employee in any circumstance.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Once the decision to undertake a workplace investigation has been made, it is important to decide who is the most appropriate person to conduct the investigation. For the investigation process to run smoothly a single lead investigator should be selected, although they may work with a larger team. The lead investigator and investigation team can be internally or externally appointed.

In deciding whether to appoint an external investigator an employer should consider:

- the nature of the allegations;
- the seniority of the respondent;
- whether a fair investigation can be conducted internally without any actual or perceived bias;
- whether there is a dedicated HR department with someone who has the required capability, skills and experience to conduct the investigation; and
- whether the employer wants the investigation to be covered by legal professional privilege.

If the employer decides to investigate the matter internally without appointing a third party, then the investigator does not need to have any specific qualifications. However, it is prudent to confirm that the investigator has the time and skills to conduct the investigation and that they can be objective.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

An investigator does not have to hold any minimum qualifications. More often than not it is an employee's manager or HR manager who is carrying out the investigation. Crucially, the person carrying out the investigation must not be involved in the complaint, as an argument of bias could be made before the investigation begins. The investigator should also be of suitable seniority to the respondent and have the necessary skills and experience to carry out an investigation. If a recommendation by the investigator is made to progress the matter to a disciplinary process, which may in turn be the subject of the appeal, there should be adequate, neutral personnel within the organisation to deal with each stage. Again if the investigator and the disciplinary decisionmaker are the same person, an argument of bias will be made that

will usually lead to a breach of fair procedures and any decision being unsustainable. Frequently, employers outsource the investigation to an external third party as there may simply not be adequate personnel within the organisation to carry out the process. Employers should ensure that within their policies the right to appoint an internal or external investigator is reserved.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

The respondent has several rights including the right to have the complaint investigated in a fair, impartial and adequate manner, to hear the allegations in full and to not be victimised. However, there is no avenue for a respondent to bring legal action to stop a procedurally fair investigation.

In 2014, Australia introduced an anti-bullying jurisdiction which gave the Fair Work Commission (FWC) the powers to issue a Stop Bullying Order. There have been circumstances where it has been successfully argued that an investigation itself amounted to bullying and accordingly the respondent applied to the FWC for a Stop Bullying Order to suspend the investigation.

Last updated on 25/09/2023

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Arguably yes, but it is the exception rather than the rule and it will depend upon the circumstances of the case. Generally, courts would be slow to intervene in ongoing workplace investigations. However, an employee may seek injunctive relief to prevent an investigation if they can show that the investigation is being conducted in breach of a policy or breach of fair procedures to such an extent that there is no reasonable prospect that the investigation's outcome(s) could be sustainable.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Co-workers can be interviewed as part of an investigation where they are witnesses to a complaint. If the employee refuses to attend the interview or is generally not cooperating with the investigation, the reasons for this will need to be considered carefully by the employer. Employers should consider whether there can be any amendments made to the interview process to accommodate the employee. However, an employer can make a reasonable and lawful direction to an employee to attend an interview. If an employee fails to comply with a lawful and reasonable direction, then it may constitute grounds for disciplinary action.

Witnesses who are employees are entitled to the legal protections that ordinarily attach to their employment, including not being bullied, discriminated against, or harassed and having their health and safety protected. Employers should also ensure that witnesses are not victimised as a result of participating in the investigation and that confidentiality is maintained.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Yes, but a qualified yes. To deny an employee who is the respondent to the complaint the right to cross-examine the complainant during a workplace investigation may amount to a breach of fair procedures. This does not mean in practice that a complainant or witness will have to physically or virtually attend a meeting to be subjected to cross-examination. What usually happens, in practice, is that specific questions of the respondent are put to the witness by the investigator for them to respond. On occasion and depending on the circumstances, the witnesses may respond in writing.

Generally, if witnesses do not wish to participate in workplace investigations and they are not the witnesses from whom the complaint originated, there is little that can be done. An employee may not want to be seen as going against a colleague, which impacts the wider issue of staff morale. An employer cannot force them to participate. Also an employee who is the respondent should be careful about seeking to compel witnesses to attend. While the respondent may request support from a colleague to act as a witness, that colleague may view things differently, which can lead to further issues.

In any event, employees cannot be victimised or suffer any adverse treatment for having acted as a witness.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

As part of an investigation, the investigator may want to collect evidence such as camera footage from CCTV, swipe card records, computer records, telephone records or recordings and GPS tracking. There are state-based workplace surveillance laws that operate in each jurisdiction in Australia. The laws recognise that employers are justified in monitoring workplaces for proper purposes, but this is balanced against employees' reasonable expectations of privacy.

The Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) (Privacy Act) also regulates how certain organisations handle personal information, sensitive personal information and employee records. The Privacy Act contains 13 privacy principles that regulate the collection and management of information. Employers should familiarise

themselves with the privacy principles before conducting any investigation to ensure they are not in breach when gathering evidence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Under the GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation), personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner in relation to the data subject. The Data Protection Commission published Data Protection in the Workplace: Employer Guidance in April 2023, which is a useful guide.

Employers should exercise caution when gathering physical evidence that may involve the use of CCTV or other surveillance practices. The Irish Court of Appeal in the case of *Doolin v DPC* examined the use by an employer of CCTV footage for disciplinary purposes and found such use constituted unlawful further processing. The original reason for processing the CCTV footage was to establish who was responsible for terrorist-related graffiti that was carved into a table in the staff tearoom. It subsequently transpired Mr Doolin, who was in no way connected to the graffiti incident, had accessed the tearoom for unauthorised breaks and a workplace investigation followed. The original reason for viewing the CCTV related to security, but further use of the CCTV footage in the disciplinary investigation was not related to the original reason. This case confirms that employers must have clear policies in place in compliance with both GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018 specifying the purpose for which CCTV or any other monitoring system is being used. Not only that, but these policies must be communicated to employees specifying the use of such practices.

It is not only data about the investigation that must be processed fairly, but any retention of the data, which can only be further processed with good reason. It is a legitimate business reason to retain data to deal with any subsequent requests or appeals under various internal or statutory processes, provided employees have been advised of the relevant retention period.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

The starting position is that there is no general right for an employer to search an employee's possessions. However, an employer may be able to undertake a search in circumstances where:

- the employee consents to the search;
- there is a "right to search" contained in a contract, policy, procedure or industrial instrument; or
- the request to search constitutes a lawful and reasonable direction.

If an employee agrees to a search of their possessions, this consent should be confirmed in writing. If the employee does not consent then the employer can issue a direction to the employee. If the direction is lawful and reasonable, and the employee does not comply, then disciplinary action may be considered.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*

at Ogier

The first consideration here is what constitutes "employees' possessions". More often than not, employees will be using employer property and there should be clear policies in place that specify company property.

The difficulty arises if an employee is using personal equipment such as a mobile phone for work purposes. While there may be specific applications dealing with work-related matters that are accessible by the employer remotely, some applications may be device-specific and that is where issues may arise. In such instances, it is not unreasonable to ask the employee to provide such information or consent to a search of their personal property. However, this is the exception rather than the rule and all other legitimate avenues of obtaining such information should be explored first. Further, such requests for information should not be a fishing expedition as an employee has a reasonable expectation of privacy at work, which must be balanced against the rights of the employer to run their business and protect the interests of their organisation.

A search of physical items such as a desk or drawers should only be conducted in exceptional circumstances, even where there is a clear, legitimate justification to search and the employee should be present at the search.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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.

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

A complaint will be a whistleblowing complaint where a complainant has reasonable grounds to suspect that the information they are disclosing about the organisation concerns misconduct or an improper state of affairs or circumstances. The information can be about the organisation or an officer or employee of the organisation engaging in conduct that:

- breaches the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth);
- breaches other financial sector laws;
- breaches any other law punishable by 12 months' imprisonment; or
- represents a danger to the public or the financial system.

Since 2020, all public companies, large proprietary companies and trustees of registrable superannuation entities in Australia are required to have a whistleblower policy. Employers conducting an investigation will need to follow the processes outlined in their policy.

One of the key differences when conducting an investigation that involves whistleblowing is identity protection and the ability of the whistleblower to disclose anonymously and remain anonymous.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Most whistleblowing policies will include a section that provides for an initial assessment of the complaint as to whether it meets the definition of a protected disclosure. This assessment, which ought to be carried out by a designated person who has been appointed to deal with disclosures, is a useful tool as some matters which may be labelled as whistleblowing may fall under the grievance procedure.

Where there are grounds, an investigation will be commenced. Under the Protected Disclosures (Amendment) Act 2022, whistleblowers are protected from penalisation for having made a protected disclosure, under the Act.

Penalisation may include; suspension, lay-off or dismissal; demotion, loss of opportunity for promotion or withholding of promotion; transfer of duties, change of location or place of work; reduction in wages or change in working hours; the imposition or administering of any discipline, reprimand or other penalty (including a financial penalty); coercion, intimidation, harassment or ostracism; or discrimination, disadvantage or unfair treatment.

If an employee (which includes trainees, volunteers, and job applicants) alleges that they have suffered penalisation as a result of making a protected disclosure, they may apply to the Circuit Court for interim relief within 21 days of the date of the last act of penalisation by the employer.

A claim for penalisation may also be brought before the WRC within six months of the alleged act of

penalisation. If an employee alleges that they were dismissed for having made a protected disclosure, the potential award that the WRC can make increases from the usual unfair dismissal cap of two years' pay to up to five years' gross pay, based on actual loss.

Where a complaint of whistleblowing is made, employers should ensure that they appoint investigators with the appropriate knowledge and expertise to deal with such a matter and comply with the time limits set by legislation.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Confidentiality protects the interests of the persons involved in the investigation as well as the integrity of the investigation. Before providing information as part of the investigation, employers should direct the complainant, respondent or witnesses to sign confidentiality agreements. This agreement should direct the person to refrain from discussing the investigation or matters that are the subject of the investigation with any person other than the investigator.

It is also best practice for participants in the investigation to be directed not to victimise (threaten or subject to any detriment) any persons who are witnesses to or are otherwise involved in the investigation.

After an investigation, employers should write to the complainant, respondent and any witnesses reminding them of their ongoing confidentiality obligations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

This will depend on the nature of the investigation but, generally, investigations should be conducted on a confidential basis. All who participate in the investigation should be informed and reminded that confidentiality is a paramount consideration taken very seriously. However, it should be borne in mind that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed by an employer as the respondent in an investigation is entitled to know who has made complaints against them. Furthermore, the respondent is entitled to cross-examine the complainant and any witnesses, although in practice this right is rarely invoked strictly and is facilitated by the investigator, with questions from the respondent being put to the complainant and other witnesses.

On occasion, a breach of confidentiality may warrant disciplinary action, but this will depend on the circumstances. Exceptions to the requirement to keep matters confidential will of course apply where employees seek support and advice from others such as companions, trade union representatives or legal advisors. It may also not be possible to maintain confidentiality where regulators or the authorities are informed of the investigation.

Also, confidentiality may not be maintained if it is in the interests of the employer to communicate the complaint and any subsequent investigation, for example on a health and safety basis.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

To ensure procedural fairness, the allegations must be put to the respondent in writing in advance of the investigation interview. The allegations must be specific, but the respondent does not need to be provided with a copy of the original complaint. The respondent should also be informed that if the allegations are substantiated they may result in disciplinary action up to and including the termination of the employee's employment.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Under the fair procedures outlined above, details of the allegations or complaints against the employee should be put to them to enable them to fully respond to the allegations raised. The employee should also be provided with any relevant policies pertaining to the allegations against them, along with all documentary evidence of the allegations and the specific terms of reference that define the scope of the investigation. The employee should also be informed of their right to be represented, see question 15.

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.

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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Employers will generally take steps to treat complaints sensitively and confidentially. However, because of the obligations employers have, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed as part of the investigation and the complainant, respondent and witnesses should be made aware of this.

Understandably, the complainant or witnesses may wish to remain anonymous. However, because the details of the allegations need to be put to the respondent so that they can provide an informed response or explanation, the source of the information will often need to be disclosed.

Employers can take steps to “ringfence” the investigation by asking employees to sign a confidentiality agreement. This will protect the interests of the participants of the investigation and uphold the integrity of the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Failure by an employer to provide the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information seriously impinges upon the employee's right to fair procedure and could result in a flawed investigation.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Non-disclosure agreements, also known as confidentiality agreements, can be used to maintain the confidentiality of the investigation. In this agreement, the employee will be directed to maintain confidentiality concerning the investigation and matters that are the subject of the investigation, and not speak to anyone outside the investigation team about the investigation without authorisation.

Confidentiality agreements are legal documents. Employees should be informed that a breach of the confidentiality agreement could result in disciplinary action being taken against them, up to and including termination of their employment.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

There is no legislation regarding NDAs, but there is a Bill before the legislature proposing to “restrict the use of non-disclosure agreements as they relate to incidents of workplace sexual harassment and discrimination”. It is currently at the report stage. Whether it passes remains to be seen, but there has in recent times been strong criticism of the use of NDAs to cover up matters that ought to be fully investigated and dealt with in an organisation.

Settlement agreements, however they arise, may include confidentiality clauses which may, depending on the terms of the agreement, extend to the fact and substance of an investigation, but as in the UK an employee's right to make a protected disclosure or report a criminal offence cannot be waived by signing an NDA.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Investigation materials are not privileged and an employer may be required to disclose them in subsequent legal proceedings. If an employer is concerned about privilege attaching to an investigation, they should engage a legal practitioner to facilitate the investigation.

Employers who are concerned about privilege attaching to investigation materials should also consider the method of a lawyer's engagement. The lawyer should be expressly engaged to investigate, report and to assist the employer by providing legal advice. Additional benefits can be achieved if the legal practitioner engages an external investigator to investigate the complaint and prepare the investigation report. Privilege will attach to the investigation materials because they are prepared for the lawyer to allow the lawyer to provide legal advice to the employer.

It is important that employers do not expressly or inadvertently waive privilege. For example, by disclosing the investigation report or substantial contents of the investigation report. It is a balance between providing information to the respondent and complainant about the outcome of the investigation and disclosing too much information.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

It would be difficult to assert privilege over materials that relate to the investigation itself.

Privilege may arise before the instigation of an investigation where an employer may seek legal advice from their legal advisors over the initial complaint and appropriate next steps. Subject to the relevant tests being met, Legal Advice Privilege arises in respect of a confidential communication that takes place between a professionally qualified lawyer and a client. Who the client is will be of significant importance as they must be capable of giving instructions to their lawyer, on behalf of the employer. Caution should be exercised by employers if advice to "the client" is disseminated further within the business to other members of management. If such a scenario arises, then there is a risk that privilege may be waived and such material could be disclosable under a data subject access request. Litigation privilege arises with respect to confidential communications that take place between a lawyer or a client and a third party for the dominant purpose of preparing for litigation, whether existing or reasonably contemplated.

It is also prudent to consider whether an external investigator should have access to their own independent legal advisor, and the funding arrangements for such advice would have to be considered by the employer.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

The respondent should be given the opportunity to have a support person present during the investigation meeting and any subsequent conversations that concern the termination of their employment. Failure to allow the respondent to have a support person may result in any subsequent termination of employment being found to be an unfair dismissal. This is because under the Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth), when the FWC is considering whether a dismissal is an unfair dismissal, they must consider any unreasonable refusal by the employer to allow the person to have a support person present to assist at any discussions relating to dismissal.

Employers should request that the respondent inform them 48 hours before any meeting of the identity of their support person. This will allow the employer to confirm the support person's suitability. A support person can be a legal representative or trade union representative, but the role of a support person is limited to assisting the employee and they are not there to act as an advocate or representative.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

This depends on the nature of the investigation. If the complaint originates from an employee as a grievance, then the employee would have the right to representation during the investigation. Representation in this context is more akin to the right to be accompanied, as in the UK by either a colleague or trade union representative.

If the investigation is a fact-gathering investigation originating from the employer, then the employee would not have the right to be represented during the investigation. That right would apply only at any subsequent disciplinary hearing.

If the investigation is a fact-finding investigation as part of a disciplinary process originating from the employer, then the employee ought to be given the right to be represented at that investigation stage. Again the right is akin to the right to be accompanied. There was concern from employers that the right had been expanded to legal representation in disciplinary matters with the case of *McKelvey v Irish Rail*. However, the Supreme Court in that case clarified that the right to legal representation in disciplinary processes is only in exceptional circumstances.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

A trade union does not have any right to be informed of, or involved in, an investigation by an employer. However, an employee may request that their support person is a trade union member or trade union representative. This is appropriate and should be permitted.

Employers should review the terms of an employment contract, policy or industrial instrument as this may contain terms regarding trade union involvement. In particular, heavily-unionised workplaces may contain enterprise agreements which contain relevant clauses.

Last updated on 25/09/2023



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

This will depend on the agreement with the works council or trade union. The employee who is the respondent to the investigation may have views on their trade union being informed, aside from any agreement, which should be taken into account under GDPR provisions.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Employers should be conscious that the investigation may have an impact on the complainant, respondent and witnesses. Employers will need to consider how to support their employees. The level of support provided will often depend on the size of the organisation and programmes already in place.

Many employers have an Employee Assistance Programme and employees should be reminded about this programme if further support or assistance is required. An employer's HR team may also be able to assist if an employee has concerns about the progress of an investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

If an employee assistance programme is in place, an employee irrespective of their role in the investigation should be directed to the programme and encouraged to avail of the services. Investigations can become protracted and employees should be kept informed as to progress and what is required of them regarding participation. Regular checks of the health and well-being of employees should also be made. Even if such a programme is not in place, occasionally and depending on the issues giving rise to the investigation, it may be appropriate for the employer to cover the cost of counselling to a certain extent.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

During the investigation, unrelated matters can come to light, usually made by the complainant or a witness during the interview process. Unrelated matters may take the form of further complaints against the respondent (but on grounds that are outside the scope of the current investigation), or entirely different complaints.

An employer should first assess the nature of the new allegations. Entirely unrelated matters should be dealt with separately. However, if the matter relates to the respondent it may be appropriate to obtain consent from the respondent and complainant for the scope of the investigation to be widened. It is important to remember that all allegations must be put to the respondent and they must be given an opportunity to respond.

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

If an investigator finds other issues that are outside the scope of the terms of reference, these should not be ignored but equally should not be included as part of the investigation, as they are beyond the remit of the investigation that was established at the beginning. An investigator should identify the other matters that may require further action and report these to the employer separately so as not to conflate issues.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

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

Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

If a respondent raises a grievance during the investigation this should be dealt with under any employment contract, grievance policy or industrial instrument. This may involve investigating and responding accordingly. The content of the grievance should be carefully considered, but in many circumstances it is appropriate for the initial investigation to continue. Multiple investigations can be run simultaneously.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

If the subject of the grievance relates to the subject of the investigation, the employee should be reassured that all the matters that they wish to raise concerning the matter under investigation will be dealt with in full as part of the investigation.

If the employee raises a grievance that is unrelated to the matter under investigation, then that can be dealt with concurrently, albeit by a separate investigator.

The initial investigation does not automatically need to be halted upon receipt of a grievance. Frequently, grievances are submitted in the hope that they derail or delay the original investigation. Careful consideration should be given as to the nature of the grievance and the appropriate course of action adopted.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off

sick during the investigation?



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

It is not uncommon for respondents to an investigation to take personal or carer's leave (sick leave) claiming that they are suffering from stress or anxiety. If this occurs, employers need to act appropriately, but this does not necessarily involve stopping the investigation process.

Employers should:

- assess the medical evidence to ascertain the respondent's condition and determine how long they are likely to be unwell;
- avoid exacerbating the condition;
- determine whether the employee is unfit to attend the investigation meeting;
- take into consideration the evidence of other witnesses;
- consider delaying the investigation for a short period; and
- consider conducting the interviews in other ways, for example, in writing.

While all efforts should be made to accommodate an employee who has taken personal or carer's leave during an investigation, if the respondent does not participate in the investigation, the investigation report may be prepared based on the available evidence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

If an employee goes off sick during the investigation, it is reasonable to adjourn the investigation until the employee is fit to return to work. Difficulties arise if it is a prolonged absence. The absence may necessitate a referral to an occupational health expert and it may be necessary to seek medical advice as to whether the employee can continue to participate in the investigation. It may be that reasonable accommodations should be considered to ensure that the employee can continue to participate. Such situations may impinge on the investigator's ability to conclude the investigation. In that instance, it would be prudent for the investigator to document all attempts to involve the employee in the investigation and to assess whether it can be concluded without the further involvement of the employee.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

There are circumstances of misconduct in the workplace that can also constitute criminal conduct and be subject to a criminal or regulatory investigation. This can include physical or sexual assault, theft, fraud, illegal drug use or stalking.

An employer can proceed with an investigation to determine whether the respondent engaged in misconduct on the balance of probabilities. The employer can terminate an employee's employment before the outcome of any criminal investigation. However, the employer must keep in mind that procedural fairness must be afforded to the employee, particularly in circumstances where an employee is awaiting the outcome of a court proceeding.

Alternatively, an employer may decide to suspend the employee pending the outcome of the criminal investigation. If a criminal act has been committed, then the employer may decide to terminate the employee's employment.

Co-operation with the police and regulatory authorities is sensible and evidence can be compelled by the police or regulators by, for example, a subpoena, search warrant or an order for production.

Last updated on 23/09/2023



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Workplace investigations can originate from criminal investigations or proceedings. It may be that an employer only becomes aware of a matter through the involvement of the police (An Garda Síochána) or regulatory bodies.

If a criminal investigation is pending it can complicate a workplace investigation, but it will be specific to the nature of the complaint. Likewise, where a regulatory investigation is in scope, an employee may argue that any internal investigation should be put on hold, on the basis that it will harm any regulatory investigation. Such matters will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis as it may be some time before any regulation investigation commences, by which time the workplace investigation and any subsequent process may have been concluded.

Employers will also have to consider their reporting obligations to An Garda Síochána. If the matter relates to fraud, misuse of public money, bribery, corruption or money laundering, for example, reporting obligations arise under section 19 of the Criminal Justice Act 2011. A failure to report information that an employer knows or believes might be of material assistance in preventing the commission of an offence, or assisting in the apprehension, prosecution or conviction of another person may be guilty of an offence.

Also, the Irish Central Bank's (Individual Accountability Framework) Act 2023 (the Act) was signed into law on 9 March 2023 but has not yet been enacted. The framework provides scope for a senior executive accountability regime, which will initially only apply to banks, insurers and certain MiFID firms. However, its application may be extended soon. The Act forces employers to engage in disciplinary action against those who may have breached specific "Conduct Standards".

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Managing the outcome of the investigation is an important part of the process. The respondent must be informed of the outcome of the investigation as soon as possible after the investigation is completed and the decision-maker has decided how to proceed.

The investigator must decide whether the claims have been substantiated on the balance of probabilities and the decision-maker must decide what disciplinary action, if any, will be taken. Any disciplinary action should be proportionate to the seriousness of the misconduct. Disciplinary action could include a warning, counselling, monitoring of behaviour or termination of employment.

Ideally, the outcome of the investigation should be communicated to the respondent and complainant in writing, setting out the allegations that have been substantiated, unsubstantiated or whether there is insufficient evidence to make a finding.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

The employee whose actions are the subject of the investigation must be advised of the outcome of the investigation. They are usually provided with a copy of the investigator's report.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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.



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

The investigator should prepare a written report setting out whether the allegations are substantiated, unsubstantiated or cannot be determined due to insufficient evidence. This report should be used for internal purposes only. Accordingly, the report should not be shared with the complainant, respondent or witnesses unless required by law, the employer's policies or another industrial instrument. It is particularly important not to share the investigation report should the employer wish to maintain privilege in respect of the report.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

The investigation report should be shared in full, unless there is some specific reason for not doing so. One example is where there is a possibility of a criminal investigation; in that instance, it may be appropriate not to share the full report. Occasionally, there may be several respondents involved in the complaint, and each respondent may only be entitled to the report that relates to them.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

Employers must take steps to deal with the findings of the investigation and implement any recommendations promptly. This may involve commencing disciplinary action.

The complainant and respondent need to be informed of the outcome of the investigation. All witnesses who participated in the investigation should also be thanked for their contribution and advised that the investigation has been completed. All participants in an investigation should be reminded of their ongoing obligations concerning confidentiality and victimisation.

If an employer decides that it may be appropriate to terminate a respondent's employment, the employee must be provided with the opportunity to respond and to "show cause" as to why their employment should not be terminated.

The investigation report along with any other materials produced during the investigation should be kept in a separate confidential file.

Employers should also consider whether action should be taken at an organisational level to prevent future misconduct. In particular, employers are required to take a proactive approach to addressing systemic workplace cultural issues in relation to sex discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation.

Last updated on 25/09/2023



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

The investigator will usually set out recommendations within their report. It will then be up to the employer to act on those recommendations and to accept or reject the findings (if it were a fact-finding investigation). If, for example, a recommendation is made that the matter should proceed to a disciplinary hearing, the employer should then arrange such a hearing and nominate an impartial member of management to carry out the disciplinary hearing. In some instances, recommendations are made by investigators to provide training or update policies and such recommendations should be acted upon without delay. It may also be appropriate to notify a specific regulator of the outcome of the investigation.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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.

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?



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

The outcome of the investigation must be disclosed to the complainant and respondent. If there is a concurrent police or regulatory investigation, they may request a copy of the investigation report. Employers should generally cooperate with regulatory authorities, but should be careful about disclosing the investigation report as this may be privileged and privacy obligations must be considered. Employers should consider only disclosing the investigation findings and interview records if compelled to do so by regulators or police.

Interview reports, the investigation report and communications about the investigation should be kept in a separate file. The file should be marked confidential and access to the file should be restricted.

If proceedings are commenced, the investigation materials may be subject to disclosure unless legal professional privilege can be asserted, see above.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Depending on the nature of the subject matter of the investigation, it may be appropriate to notify the Garda Síochána or a specific government body such as Revenue. Also, if the employee occupies a regulated position, it may be necessary to inform the relevant regulator. Again, compliance with GDPR obligations should be borne in mind.

Last updated on 11/10/2023



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

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



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

There are legal requirements related to the time you must keep certain employee records in Australia, such as pay slips and time sheets. However, there are no laws concerning disciplinary records.

Employers can rely on previous misconduct to justify an employee's termination of employment where it can be shown it is part of a course of conduct. Accordingly, if complaints have been substantiated, and disciplinary action has been taken, these records should be maintained. However, if a significant period has elapsed since the misconduct, an employer should carefully consider whether it is appropriate to rely on this past behaviour to justify future disciplinary action for similar conduct.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Ireland

 Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Irrespective of the outcome of the investigation, the fact that an employee was subject to an investigation is not the key issue. The key concern is whether any further action was taken as a result of the investigation. If a disciplinary process ensued, then it is the outcome of that disciplinary record and any subsequent appeal that would or would not be noted on an employee's record. If a disciplinary sanction were imposed then the length of time the sanction remains on the employee's record would depend on what is specified in the disciplinary policy.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

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

27. What legal exposure could the employer face for

errors during the investigation?



Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*
at People + Culture Strategies

It is important for employers to conduct procedurally fair investigations that result in a fair outcome. Failure to do so may expose the employer to various claims by an employee. The most common type of claim following an investigation is an unfair dismissal claim. If a respondent's employment is terminated because of an investigation, they may be eligible to bring an unfair dismissal claim in the FWC alleging their dismissal was harsh, unjust or unreasonable.

An employee may also bring a bullying, discrimination or general protections claim. These claims may be made even where the investigation does not result in the employee's dismissal.

If an employer has departed from the procedures set out in their policies, or they have not followed the terms of an employee's employment contract or another applicable industrial instrument then an employee may bring a claim for breach of contract.

Australia has also recently introduced the "Respect@Work" legislation which places a positive obligation on employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate sex discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation, as far as possible. Accordingly, an employer who is not perceived to have taken a proactive and fair approach to these workplace issues faces significant legal exposure.

Failure to conduct an investigation properly (or a failure to conduct an investigation in circumstances where it is needed) can also cause significant reputational and financial risk.

Last updated on 25/09/2023



Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

A failure to follow fair procedures in the investigation can have significant consequences.

Although the exception rather than the rule, an employee could challenge the investigation through injunctive proceedings if there is a breach of fair procedures. Such action would be taken before the High Court. Injunction proceedings may be brought while the investigation is ongoing, or just before its conclusion to prevent publication of a report making specific findings against an employee. A successful injunction may curtail any subsequent attempt to investigate the matter as allegations of penalisation, prejudice and delay may arise.

Errors during the investigation can also give rise to a complaint of constructive dismissal, with allegations that flaws in the procedure have fundamentally breached the implied term of mutual trust and confidence.

A flawed investigation can also undermine any disciplinary process and sanction that is imposed as a result. This commonly occurs when an employee has been dismissed following a disciplinary process launched on foot of the investigation. While dismissal may be an appropriate sanction, the dismissal can still be found to be unfair if there is a failure to follow fair procedures. An employee may challenge their dismissal before the WRC and the employer should be alive to not only an unfair dismissal complaint, but allegations of discrimination and penalisation.

Overall, to carry out a successful workplace investigation, an employer should consider taking advice at the earliest opportunity to ensure that the investigation can withstand challenges.

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.

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

Contributors



Australia

Joydeep Hor
Kirryn West James
Chris Oliver
People + Culture Strategies



Ireland

Bláthnaid Evans
Mary Gavin
Ogier



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



Thailand

Ratthai Kamolwarin
Norrapat Werajong
Chandler MHM