

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?

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Currently there are no unified laws, administrative regulations or policies in the field of labor laws in People's Republic of China (referred to as "PRC") regarding investigations on workplaces of ordinary employers. The laws and regulations of employers in certain specific industries (such as banking, securities, insurance, medical institutions, etc.) and the laws and regulations governing certain personnel (such as officers of state-owned enterprises and members of the Communist Party of China) contain provisions relating to investigations on employees' conduct, but such provisions are only applicable to the aforementioned specific industries or personnel.

Employers generally will specify their investigation rights and rules and procedures of internal investigations in their internal rules and regulations (such as the employee handbook) or the employment contracts entered into with their employees. However, it should be noted that workplace investigations are still subject to laws and regulations in relation to personal information, privacy and data protection.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

No specific rules directly govern a workplace investigation in the event of employee misconduct. However, several rules, both legal and administrative, affect the conduct of such an investigation. In addition, codes of conduct, internal regulations or guidelines may also exist within companies.

A new law (No. 2022-401) came into effect on 1 September 2022 and constitutes one of the cornerstones for future regulation of workplace investigations. This law transposes into French law the European directive relating to whistleblower protection. It does not, however, constitute a revolution, as a previous French law dated 9 December 2016 (the so-called Sapin 2 Law) already provided the whistleblower with a specific status and protection. These laws are fundamental when considering an internal investigation as

the rules protecting the whistleblower and requiring the establishment of an internal whistleblowing channel (eg, a dedicated email or hotline) affect the degree of flexibility available to companies in conducting the investigation.

A new decree has been adopted (No. 2022-1284), dated 3 October 2022, for application of these new provisions. This decree sets out several obligations relating to the internal whistleblowing reporting process. The reporting channel will necessarily contribute to shape the internal investigation triggered by situations which have been reported by that channel. Companies subject to this decree may define the reporting procedure using the supporting tool of their choice (company collective agreement, internal memorandum, etc.), as long as the employee representative bodies are duly consulted on the matter. The decree also specifies that an acknowledgement of receipt of the alert must be provided to the author of the alert in writing within seven days from the company receiving the alert. The author of the alert must also be informed in writing, within a reasonable period not exceeding three months from acknowledgement of receipt of the alert, of the measures envisaged or taken to assess the accuracy of the allegations and, where appropriate, to remedy the situation which had been reported, as well as the reasons for these measures and, finally, the closure of the case.

More generally, not only do all the “pure” labour law rules relating to the protection of the human rights of employees need to be complied with (right to privacy, data protection under the GDPR, etc), but also the disciplinary rules and regulations that protect employees from unfounded sanctions imposed by their employer. For example, an employer can only sanction an employee's misconduct if the disciplinary procedure begins within two months of when the misconduct was committed or when the employer becomes aware of it. In this respect, an internal investigation can be necessary for the employer to obtain full knowledge of the facts alleged to have been committed by the employee. It is nonetheless recommended that the internal investigation be completed within these two months to avoid the risk of the disciplinary action being time-barred.

Administrative rules produced by the French anti-corruption agency should also be taken into consideration (good practice, guidelines and recommendations relating to senior management's commitment to implement anti-corruption measures, corruption risk mapping, corruption risk management measures and procedures), as well as the guidelines produced by the French Ministry of Employment relating to the prevention of sexual harassment and gender-based violence or the recommendations of the Human Rights Defender, which is a French special institution aimed at protecting fundamental rights.


When the investigation in question concerns moral or sexual harassment or violence in the workplace, the national interprofessional agreement of 26 March 2010 should be referred to. This text stipulates that in the event of an investigation procedure, it should be based on, but not limited to, the following guiding principles:

- it is in everyone's interest to act with the discretion necessary to protect everyone's dignity and privacy;
- no information, unless it is anonymized, should be divulged to parties not involved in the case in question;
- complaints must be investigated and dealt with without delay;
- all parties involved must be listened to impartially and treated fairly;
- complaints must be supported by detailed information;
- deliberate false accusations must not be tolerated, and may result in disciplinary action;
- external assistance may be useful, notably from occupational health services.

Many are calling for the adoption of legislative rules governing such investigations, and their coordination with general whistleblower protection measures.

Finally, a company must take its own rules and regulations into account. Every company with at least 50 employees has the legal obligation to draw up internal rules and regulations, which notably set out the disciplinary sanctions applicable to employees, as well as a reminder of certain employees' rights.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



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

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The employer will generally obtain clues of employees' misconduct, actively or passively, through such means as internal audit, employee whistleblowing, whistleblowing from suppliers or partners, regular or irregular compliance management assessment of the employer and management concerns, and carry out investigation based on such clues. Meanwhile, the employer will further investigate whether the employees involved have committed other acts of misconduct.

The investigation is usually carried out from outside to inside and from the macro level to the specific level. That is to first interview the provider of the clues and other insiders for verification and obtaining further information. Then to conduct internal and external system and written documents review based on the investigation clues. Preliminary evidence will be formed after the basic verification of facts. Finally, the employer will interview the employees involved and listen to their explanations, and finally determine the subsequent handling method.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

When a report of wrongdoing is brought to the employer's attention, whether through a whistleblower or another channel, and an internal investigation is expected, it may be either mandatory or optional, depending on the facts of the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigation will be mandatory when the alleged wrongdoing relates to an ethical issue according to anti-corruption regulations, the employer's duty of due diligence regarding, for example, human rights or environmental matters, or where the works council has issued an alert relating to a "serious and imminent danger" (or to "fundamental human rights"), but also whenever it relates to the employer's obligation to ensure employee safety (eg, moral or sexual harassment).

If the investigation is not mandatory, it is up to the employer to decide whether or not to carry out the investigation. Several key questions can help the employer determine whether or not it is appropriate to

carry out an investigation, such as:

- What are the benefits of doing nothing? The company will have to draw up a list of the pros and cons of an investigation, bearing in mind that in some cases a poorly conducted investigation could make the situation worse;
- What is the priority (eg, obtaining or securing evidence, or correcting the irregularity)?
- What rules or codes of ethics must the company comply with?
- Should external legal counsel only advise the company or should they play a major role in the investigation process by becoming an investigator?

Last updated on 27/11/2023



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

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

When an employer is found to have engaged in misconduct of an employee, whether it has the right to suspend the employee from his/her duties and subject him/her to investigation, there are no explicit provisions in the existing labor law. Generally speaking, suspension of investigation arranged internally by an employer is within the scope of autonomous management of the employer. However, such suspension of investigation is subject to certain restrictions, and the basic rights and interests of the employee must be guaranteed. For example, the employer should continue to pay social insurance fund for the employee.

Suspension investigation shall generally be specified in advance in the labor contract or rules and regulations, and the duration of suspension investigation should be within the necessary and reasonable period. Indefinite suspension or the suspension of obviously long time will not be supported by arbitral tribunals and courts.

Generally annual leave may be taken preferentially by the employees during suspension period. The annual leave period shall be deemed as normal attendance, and the salary shall remain unchanged. Under the circumstance that the annual leave has been used up, in judicial practice, there are few cases supporting the claim that the employer can fully deduct the employee's salary during the suspension period. It is generally believed that the employer shall at least guarantee the basic living needs of the employee during the suspension period (i.e. the salary shall not be lower than the local minimum salary standard) or pay the employee as per the original salary standard. However, in judicial practice, some arbitrators and judges hold the view that an employer may use its discretion to reduce employees' salary if all of the following conditions are met:

- it is stipulated in its rules and regulations or a contract that it is entitled to suspend employees from their duties and reduce salaries if their fraudulent behaviour harms the employer's interests;
- the rules and regulations are stipulated in its rules and regulations, and are publicly announced and accepted by the employees; and
- there is evidence showing the corresponding fraudulent behaviour of the employees.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An employee may be suspended or relocated during a workplace investigation by:

- suspending the employee as a precautionary measure (eg, pending a confirmation of dismissal);
- temporarily assigning the employee to another site; or
- exempting the employee from having to work while continuing to pay them their salary.

The employee can be suspended as a precautionary measure, pending confirmation of dismissal, but this implies that disciplinary proceedings have already begun and that the investigation is therefore at a relatively advanced stage and that there is sufficient evidence to suggest the need for disciplinary action. It should be made clear to the employee that the suspension is a provisional measure (in the absence of specifying this, the suspension could be interpreted as a disciplinary layoff constituting a sanction and, in some jurisdictions, as depriving the employer of the possibility of dismissing the employee for the same facts).

Temporary reassignment can also be considered. However, this contractual change must not apply for long and the measure taken must be temporary. The employer must act promptly – the measure is only valid for as long as the investigation continues. Failing this, and because of the absence of concurrent disciplinary proceedings, there is considerable risk that the temporary reassignment may be reclassified by a judge as an illegal modification of the employment contract or as a disciplinary sanction preventing the employee from subsequently being dismissed.

Finally, paid exemption from work is also possible and consists of temporarily suspending, by mutual agreement, the obligation of the employer to provide work for the employee and the employee's obligation to work, without affecting their remuneration. Such a measure must generally be taken with the consent of the employee, because it implies a suspension (and therefore a modification) of the employment contract. This measure may be useful in temporarily removing an employee with whom the employer maintains a good relationship. This may be an employee who is or feels they are a victim of harassment, especially when the employee is not on sick leave.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

It is possible to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation.^[1] While there are no limits on duration, the employee will remain entitled to full pay during this time.

^[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 181.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

In some laws and regulations for specific industries, enterprises or personnel, there are certain requirements for the qualifications of investigators. For example, according to the Interim Measures for Investigating and Dealing with Disciplinary Violations of Professional Personnel by Medical Institutions, the personnel conducting an investigation and evidence collection shall not be less than two. If the investigator is a close relative of the investigated person, or a tip-off person or a key witness of the issue to be investigated, the investigator shall withdraw from the investigation.

However, at present, there are no unified and detailed national rules and regulations on the qualification of the investigators and organizations. In practice, the selection of the personnel and organizations responsible for internal investigation is usually based on the relevant provisions in the internal rules and regulations of the employer. The personnel conducting internal investigation are usually internal functional departments of the employer and are independent to some extent, including the personnel department, legal department, compliance department or risk control department. For significant or complex issues or senior management investigations, in order to ensure professionalism, accuracy and compliance, external law firms, consultants and accounting firms are also frequently hired to conduct investigations.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In determining who is to conduct a workplace investigation, the main objective is to ensure that the team is independent or at least that it is perceived as being independent. The key people in the investigation team can be identified in a pre-established procedure. It is good practice to give decision-makers the possibility to set up, on a case-by-case basis, the team most appropriate to the situation.



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

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

There is no provision in the law which provides the employee the right to suspend or interrupt an investigation by initiating a lawsuit. However, the employee who is suspended for investigation may request to terminate the employment contract unilaterally and demand the employer to pay economic compensation on the ground that the employer has not paid enough remuneration, and may initiate labor arbitration and litigation accordingly, but such arbitration and litigation will not have the effect of suspending or interrupting the investigation.

In addition, if the employee's privacy or personal information is improperly disposed of during the investigation, the relevant evidence obtained during the suspension investigation may be deemed as illegal evidence by arbitral tribunals and courts, and the employer may also be exposed to relevant legal liabilities for the infringement of privacy, etc.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An internal investigation is not a police enquiry or a judicial instruction; there is no legal provision enabling an employee to stop the investigation. At the same time, there is no legal provision enabling the employer to force an employee to be interviewed. Interviewing an employee within the context of an internal investigation is also not a disciplinary matter. Therefore, the employee has no right to be assisted by another employee or an employee representative. The employee could, however, lawfully request the

presence of their lawyer, especially if the company's lawyer is part of the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

The accused could theoretically request a court to stop the investigation, for instance, by arguing that there is no reason for the investigation and that the investigation infringes the employee's personality rights. However, if the employer can prove that there were grounds for reasonable suspicion and is conducting the investigation properly, it is unlikely that such a request would be successful.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Article 75 of the Civil Procedure Law of the PRC (Amended in 2021) provides, "All entities and individuals that are aware of the circumstances of a case shall have the obligation to testify in court. The persons-in-charge of relevant entities shall support the witnesses to testify in court. "Article 193 of the Criminal Procedure Law of the PRC (Amended in 2018) provides, "Where, after the notification of a people's court, a witness refuses to testify in court without justified reasons, the people's court may compel the witness to appear in court, unless the witness is the spouse, a parent or a child of the defendant."

According to relevant provisions of the Civil Procedure Law of the PRC, only a court has the power to compel a witness to appear in court. Neither the employer nor any other individual may compel any colleague to act as a witness and testify in court. However, the employer may set forth in the employment contract or its internal rules and regulations that the employee shall cooperate with its internal investigation.

As for the legal system for witness protection, PRC's criminal procedure laws stipulate a relatively detailed legal system for witness protection, such as establishing a crime of retaliating against a witness; making public a witness's personal information such as name, address, employer and contact information for the purpose of protecting the personal safety of the witness; using assumed names in the indictments; and so on. However, there are relatively few legal provisions regarding the legal protection of witness in civil procedure, and provisions only regulate the expenses that may be incurred by the witness for testifying in court. For instance, Article 77 of the Civil Procedure Law of the PRC (Amended in 2021) provides, "The necessary expenses incurred by a witness in fulfilling his obligation to testify in court, including transportation, accommodation and meals, as well as the loss of salaries, shall be borne by the losing party. If a party applies for a witness to testify, the costs and expenses shall be advanced by the party; if the people's court notifies a witness to testify without the application by a party, the costs and expenses shall be advanced by the people's court. "

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Co-workers can spontaneously act as witnesses and provide statements to superiors before, during or after the interviews. Co-workers can also be interviewed as witnesses at the investigator's request, although they are not under any obligation to answer the questions and they cannot be compelled to do so. The investigators have an absolute obligation of discretion during the investigation and cannot reveal any details of the information gathered.

Certain employees may benefit from whistleblower status, which implies that they may be exempt from potential criminal and civil liability relating to their report or testimony and they are protected from any retaliatory measures from the employer. "Facilitators" who helped the whistleblower and the individuals connected with the whistleblower and risk retaliatory measures by testifying as a witness may also benefit from this status, as of 1 September 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

The question of whether employees may refuse to testify if they would have to incriminate themselves is disputed in legal doctrine.^[1] However, according to legal doctrine, a right to refuse to testify exists if criminal conduct regarding the questioned employee or a relative (article 168 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) is involved, and it cannot be ruled out that the investigation documentation may later end up with the prosecuting authorities (ie, where employees have a right to refuse to testify in criminal proceedings, they cannot be forced to incriminate themselves by answering questions in an internal investigation).^[2]

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on hrtoday.ch, 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

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The Civil Code of the PRC, the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC and other laws provide for the protection of employees' personal information and privacy. Employers are often involved in checking the information and materials stored in the computers, hard disks and other electronic office equipment provided to employees in internal investigation and are likely to access the employees' personal information including personal privacy information, such as the communication records stored in instant communication software such as WeChat, QQ or other instant communication software or to and from private email boxes. According to the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC, employers are required to perform the obligation of informing and obtain the individuals' consent prior to the processing of personal information, i.e. the principle of informing + consent. Moreover, the Civil Code of the PRC stipulates that no organization or individual may process any person's private information, except as otherwise provided by law or with the explicit consent of the right holder.

Therefore, the legitimacy of obtaining data evidence can be enhanced and guaranteed only if it is explicitly stated in the relevant rules and regulations that the employer shall have the right to the work equipment provided to the employees or obtains the employees' personal consent.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

GDPR principles fully apply to data gathering, as well as case law protecting the right to respect one's private life and the secret of correspondence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

^[1] Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen, in:

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Article 13 of the Constitution of the PRC provides that the lawful private property of the citizens shall not be violated. Therefore, during the process of investigation, without the employees' consent, the employer has no right to search the employees' personal possessions or files. If it is necessary to search the employees' personal possessions or files, the employer may require the employees to sign a Letter of Informed Consent before searching; or the employer may call the police and the search will be conducted under the escort of the public security authorities or directly by the public security authorities.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In internal investigations, the fundamental rights and freedoms of employees are at stake, including the right to privacy, respect for the privacy of home life and correspondence, freedom of expression, and the obligation of loyalty in searching for evidence.

In principle, work emails and files can be reviewed, even without the employee's consent, prior knowledge or warning. This includes: work email accounts; files stored on a work computer or a USB key connected to a work computer; and SMS messages and files stored on a work mobile phone and documents stored in the workplace unless they are labelled as “personal”. On the other hand, it is not permissible for an employer (or an investigator) to review “personal” emails and files, such as documents or emails identified as “personal” by the employee, or personal email accounts (Gmail, Yahoo, etc), even if accessed from a work computer.

There are certain exceptions to the above principle. An employer is allowed to check “personal” emails or data in any of the following cases:

- if the employee is present during the review;
- if the employee is absent, but was duly notified and invited to be present;
- if there is a particularly serious “specific risk or event”;
- if the review is authorised by a judge (this means having to prove a legitimate reason justifying not informing the employee).

When documents or emails are not marked as “personal” but contain information of a personal nature, the employer may open and review the data but may not use such documents or emails to justify applying disciplinary measures to the employee or use such documents or emails as evidence in court if they indeed relate to the employee’s private life.

Special attention must be given to employee representatives who must be entirely free to carry out their duties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

If there is a strong suspicion of criminal conduct on the part of the employee and a sufficiently strong justification exists, a search of private data may be justified.^[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

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

In practice, the following factors to be considered will be: (1) verification of the informant's identity; (2) whether the informant has any conflict of interest with the reported employee or whether it will affect the objectivity of their reporting; (3) how to persuade the informant to provide more information or evidence, or to cooperate in court as a witness; (4) how to increase the admissibility of evidence when the informant refuses to cooperate in court as a witness or fails to provide original evidence; (5) how to improve the evidence chain and protect the informant from being attacked or retaliated by the informant, etc.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Evidence obtained in the context of an investigation must specify who provided it and the date it was provided. No retaliatory measures may be taken against the whistleblower for the act of whistleblowing.

In certain cases, the whistleblower report must be forwarded to the judicial authorities (eg, when there is an obligation to assist persons in imminent danger, for serious offences or a disclosure that a vulnerable person is in danger (ie, minors under 15 or a person who is unable to protect themselves)).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Although there are no specific laws or regulations regulating the extent of confidentiality obligation employers or the investigators shall comply with, in practice, the confidentiality obligation of both parties usually originates from the confidentiality agreement between the employee and the employer, as well as general provisions on protection of personal information and right of privacy, etc.

In this regard, it is advisable to require the relevant personnel responsible for handling the suspension for investigation to sign a confidentiality agreement or a letter of commitment, and require them to pay attention to the protection of the personal information and privacy of the complainant and other relevant personnel, for the purpose of avoiding extra losses caused by the occurrence of disputes relating to right of reputation, right of privacy and personal information leakage during the investigation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Interviewers, investigators, interviewees or any others involved in the investigation are often bound by a reinforced confidentiality obligation, particularly when the internal investigation is triggered by a whistleblower alert. In addition, every person that comes to know of the investigation, facts or people involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. Furthermore, investigators should specifically be trained for interviews and be reminded of their obligations relating to the investigation.

The investigators will need to determine the order of the tasks to be carried out in the investigation, as this

will have a significant impact on confidentiality management. Should they start with the hearings or a review of documents? The answer may depend on the subject matter of the investigation. It is advisable to first review the documentation before organising interviews, particularly to avoid the destruction of certain documents by employees acting in bad faith or by those wishing to erase the traces of alleged wrongdoing. Sometimes, however, it is possible to start with the interviews, especially in the case of harassment, as there may be no documents to review. If the decision is taken to conduct the documentation review after the interviews, it could be useful to ask the employees involved to sign a document stating that they must preserve and retain documents, meaning that if they delete or destroy documents, they would be acting against the company and in breach of the law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

Besides the employee's duty of performance (article 319, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employment relationship is defined by the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and the employee's duty of loyalty (article 321a, Swiss Code of Obligations). Ancillary duties can be derived from the two duties, which are of importance for the confidentiality of an internal investigation.[\[1\]](#)

In principle, the employer must respect and protect the personality (including confidentiality and privacy) and integrity of the employee (article 328 paragraph 1, Swiss Code of Obligations) and take appropriate measures to protect the employee. Because of the danger of pre-judgment or damage to reputation as well as other adverse consequences, the employer must conduct an internal investigation discreetly and objectively. The limits of the duty of care are found in the legitimate self-interest of the employer.[\[2\]](#)

In return for the employer's duty of care, employees must comply with their duty of loyalty and safeguard the employer's legitimate interests. In connection with an internal investigation, employees must therefore keep the conduct of an investigation confidential. Additionally, employees must keep confidential and not disclose to any third party any facts that they have acquired in the course of the employment relationship, and which are neither obvious nor publicly accessible.[\[3\]](#)

[\[1\]](#) Wolfgang Portmann/Roger Rudolph, BSK OR, Art. 328 N 1 et seq.

[\[2\]](#) Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute*, p. 202.

[\[3\]](#) David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 133.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Although there are no explicit provisions of law or policy requiring employers to provide specific information of allegations to investigated employees, in practice, at the early stage of investigation, in order to avoid alerting the investigated employee and reduce the possibility that the investigated employee may destroy the relevant evidence, the employer usually will not disclose the information of allegations to the investigated employee at the beginning of investigation. At the later stage of an investigation, when the employer has already obtained main evidence, the employer usually will properly disclose to the investigated employee the allegations that are clearly known by the employer and have sufficient evidence, and listen to the counterparty's opinions or argument, for the purpose of obtaining more information or getting the employee's confession.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

According to the French data protection authority, the employee under investigation must be informed of the name of the person in charge of the investigation, the alleged facts that have led to the whistleblowing alert and their rights to access and rectify data collected about them. This information must be given as soon as the data collection starts, before the interviews, as per GDPR principles.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

As a result of the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), employees under investigation have certain procedural rights. These include, in principle, the right of the accused to be heard. In this context, the accused has the right to be informed at the beginning of the questioning about the subject of the investigation and at least the main allegations and they must be allowed to share their view and provide exculpatory evidence.^[1] The employer, on the other hand, is not obliged to provide the employee with existing evidence, documents, etc, before the start of the questioning.^[2]

Covert investigations in which employees are involved in informal or even private conversations to induce them to provide statements are not compatible with the data-processing principles of good faith and the requirement of recognisability, according to article 4 of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection.^[3]

Also, rights to information arise from the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. In principle, the right to information (article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) is linked to a corresponding request for information by the concerned person and the existence of data collection within the meaning of article 3 (lit. g), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. Insofar as the documents from the internal investigation recognisably relate to a specific person, there is in principle a right to information concerning these documents. Subject to certain conditions, the right to information may be denied, restricted or postponed by law (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). For example, such documents and reports may also affect the confidentiality and protection interests of third parties, such as other employees. Based on the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employer is required to protect them by taking appropriate measures (eg, by making appropriate redactions before handing out copies of the respective documents (article 9 paragraph 1 (lit. b), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection)).^[4] Furthermore, the employer may refuse, restrict or defer the provision of information where

the company's interests override the employee's, and not disclose personal data to third parties (article 9 paragraph 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). The right to information is also not subject to the statute of limitations, and individuals may waive their right to information in advance (article 8 paragraph 6, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). If there are corresponding requests, the employer must generally grant access, or provide a substantiated decision on the restriction of the right of access, within 30 days (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 paragraph 4, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection).

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

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

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

[4] Claudia Götz Staehelin, *Unternehmensinterne Untersuchungen*, 2019, p. 37.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

At the level of criminal procedure in PRC, only the Criminal Procedure Law of PRC provides that pseudonyms may be used in the indictment as a substitute for the disclosure of a witness's personal information, such as name, address, employer and contact information, to protect the personal safety of the witness. However, there are no relevant provisions on whether the identity of the complainant, the witness in civil litigation and the provider of information shall be kept confidential during an investigation.

During the course of an investigation, in order to protect the privacy of relevant personnel and avoid the risk of infringement, the employer usually keeps the identity of the complainant or the provider of investigation information confidential. However, at the civil litigation stage, the witness is unavoidably required to testify in court, and must truthfully identify himself/herself to the court.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The identity of the complainant must be kept confidential and cannot be disclosed. There are two exceptions: if the complainant consents to the disclosure; or if the employer is asked for this information by the judicial authorities.

Switzerland

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

As mentioned under Question 10, the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) also entails the employer's duty to respect and protect the personality (including confidentiality and privacy) and integrity of employees (article 328 paragraph 1, Swiss Code of Obligations) and to take appropriate measures to protect them.

However, in combination with the right to be heard and the right to be informed regarding an investigation, the accused also has the right that incriminating evidence is presented to them throughout the investigation and that they can comment on it. For instance, this right includes disclosure of the persons accusing them and their concrete statements. Anonymisation or redaction of such statements is permissible if the interests of the persons incriminating the accused or the interests of the employer override the accused' interests to be presented with the relevant documents or statements (see question 11; see also article 9 paragraphs 1 and 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). However, a careful assessment of interests is required, and these must be limited to what is necessary. In principle, a person accusing another person must take responsibility for their information and accept criticism from the person implicated by the information provided.^[1]

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

Yes. In practice, before conducting a compliance investigation, we recommend that the employer and the investigator enter into a confidentiality agreement to require the investigator to keep confidential the facts and the substance of the investigation. This will not only better protect the personal information of the complainant, the witness and the investigated employee, but also help the investigation to proceed smoothly.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*

at Bredin Prat

Most of the time, the legal protection afforded by the legally prescribed confidentiality obligation that applies to whistleblowing is sufficient. This is all the more so given every person involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. However, there is no legal obstacle to the creation of an NDA between the employer and the people involved.

NDAs setting out a strict and reinforced obligation of confidentiality and discretion during the investigation should be signed by any external parties involved (eg, translation agency, IT expert) or when the internal investigation is outside the scope of whistleblowing regulations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



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

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The employer has the property right over all its properties. When discovering employee's misconduct, the employer is entitled to conduct an investigation within a certain scope according to the relevant laws and regulations, as well as the management system of the employer. Generally speaking, the employer is not required to obtain consent of the employee when conducting an investigation of the space and objects owned by it. The employer has no right to directly conduct an investigation of the employee's private space, objects, bank accounts and stock trading accounts. The public security organ or other public authorities should be involved in the investigation. In principle, if the employee's private space or objects are mixed with the employer's private space or objects, the employer should obtain consent of the employee for an investigation. Meanwhile, the employer's investigation should be controlled within the reasonable and necessary limit, and the employer is not allowed to illegally use or disclose the investigation results, otherwise it may constitute infringement. In addition, we also recommend that the employer stipulate explicitly in the employment contract and the internal management system that the employer has the right to detain and inspect the articles or equipment distributed by the employer, so as to reduce the compliance risk of internal investigation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Privilege does not generally apply to internal investigation materials as the investigation does not constitute a relationship between a lawyer and their client, and even less so a judicial investigation. However, if a lawyer is appointed as an investigator, privilege may apply to materials exchanged between the lawyer and that client.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

As outlined above, all employees generally have the right to know whether and what personal data is being or has been processed about them (article 8 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection; article 328b, Swiss Code of Obligations).

The employer may refuse, restrict or postpone the disclosure or inspection of internal investigation documents if a legal statute so provides, if such action is necessary because of overriding third-party interests (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) or if the request for information is manifestly unfounded or malicious. Furthermore, a restriction is possible if overriding the self-interests of the responsible company requires such a measure and it also does not disclose the personal data to third parties. The employer or responsible party must justify its decision (article 9 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection).^[1]

The scope of the disclosure of information must, therefore, be determined by carefully weighing the interests of all parties involved in the internal investigation.

^[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

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The relevant laws and regulations in the PRC have not made explicit provision regarding rights to representation. In practice, some arbitral tribunals and courts hold the view that it is reasonable for the employee to refuse to cooperate with the investigation if he/she is not accompanied or has no legal representatives. Therefore, the employer usually cannot impose disciplinary punishment by warning or even termination of employment contract on the basis of such refusal. Therefore, we tend to believe that, where the employee under investigation requests to be accompanied or have legal representation, the

employer should fully consider and communicate with the employee about the request, and prudently impose disciplinary punishment on the employee for failing to cooperate with the investigation.

Of course, considering that satisfying such request will increase the difficulties and obstacles for the employer to carry out the investigation to a certain extent, we still suggest that the employer include in its rules and regulations such provisions as "the employee being investigated shall actively and unconditionally cooperate with the employer's investigation", etc., in order to provide institutional support for the follow-up requirement or even disciplinary punishment by the employer on employee and to encourage the employee to cooperate in the investigation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation has the right to be assisted by a lawyer during the interviews and, if the employee chooses to be so, the lawyer must also always be present. The employee may not, however, be accompanied by anyone other than a legal representative (ie, another employee cannot attend the interview).

Last updated on 27/11/2023



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.

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The relevant laws and regulations in the PRC have not expressly provided the employer's obligation to inform the trade union of the internal investigation or the right of the trade union to participate in the employer's internal investigation. In practice, given the confidential nature of internal investigation, the employer usually does not voluntarily inform the trade union of such information. However, in accordance with Article 25 of the Measures for the Supervision of Labor Law by Trade Unions of the PRC, the trade union shall have the right to conduct an investigation if the employer has violated the labor laws and regulations or infringed the legitimate rights and interests of the employee. Therefore, it is still possible that the employer, in the course of the internal investigation, may be investigated by the trade union if it has violated the labor laws and regulations or infringed the legitimate rights and interests of the employee (e.g. being suspected of infringing personal information or privacy).

In addition, if the employer determines that the employee has committed a serious disciplinary offence based on the result of the internal investigation and thus decides to terminate the employment contract unilaterally, it shall notify the trade union of the reasons for termination in advance. If the employer has violated the laws, administrative regulations or the provisions of the employment contract, the trade union is entitled to request the employer to make corrections.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Neither the works council nor the trade unions have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation. It is the employer who is responsible for carrying out the investigation. However, when the investigation is triggered due to a works council issuing an alert relating in particular to a "serious and imminent danger", one member of the works council must be involved in the investigation process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

In general, works councils and trade unions are not very common in Switzerland and there are no statutory rules that would provide a works council or trade union a right to be informed or involved in an ongoing internal investigation. However, respective obligations might be foreseen in an applicable collective

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The relevant laws and regulations in the PRC have not made explicit requirements regarding the supports received by the employee involved in the investigation. In practice, the employer will usually prepare an internal time schedule before carrying out the investigation. Although the detailed time schedule will not be disclosed to the employee, the employer will usually inform the employee of each investigation in advance. In order to improve the transparency of the investigation, we recommend that employer should make positive and proper responses to employee who enquires about the progress of the investigation, so as to avoid employee's suspicion.

In addition, the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC stipulates the rights of individuals in the process of personal information processing. In the scenario of internal investigation of an employer, the investigated party may, in accordance with such provisions, ask the employer for the right to review and even copy the personal information collected. Where the employee finds that the personal information collected by internal investigation is inaccurate or incomplete, he/she is entitled to request for correction or supplementation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Apart from being informed of any facts and data concerning them being collected during the investigation, employees involved in the investigation do not have any specific rights. Some companies choose to use external firms specializing in psychosocial risk management, not only to conduct internal investigations, but also to provide additional psychological support for their employees, as part of the employer's safety obligation.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

[\[1\]](#) Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 390.

[\[2\]](#) David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern, 2021, p. 133.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

If any matter unrelated to this investigation is revealed during the investigation and the matter is suspected of violating regulations, the employer may comprehensively consider whether it is necessary to investigate the new matter. If the employer assesses that a combined investigation will seriously affect and hinder the progress of the investigation or complicate the investigation, the employer can handle the unrelated matters through separate investigations.

In addition, Article 6 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC requires that the processing of personal information shall be for a specific and reasonable purpose and shall be directly related to the purpose of the processing and shall adopt the method with minimum impact on individuals' rights and interests. If the result of the investigation reveals unrelated personal information, it means that the collection and storage of such personal information are unrelated to the purpose of the processing. According to paragraph 1 of Article 47 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC, the employer as the personal information processor shall take the initiative to delete personal information. If the employer fails to delete such information, the employee is entitled to request for deletion.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Unrelated matters revealed during the investigation do not necessarily mean that another investigation will be opened. Nevertheless, if reprehensible acts unrelated to the current investigation are revealed, the employer will need to take action and sanction the perpetrator (after checking the facts). Sometimes the only way to check the facts is to carry out another investigation on a separate matter. However, the investigation team may also consider if there is enough connection between the matters to widen the scope of the current internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

There is no specific provision on this in relevant laws and regulations in the PRC. In practice, the employer will usually stipulate the relevant grievance procedure and process in its internal rules and regulations, and provide the employee with the relevant grievance rights in accordance with the grievance regulations. Alternatively, even if there is no provision on grievance procedure and process in their internal rules and regulations, from the perspective of fairness and rationality, we recommend that the employer should review and evaluate the grievance raised by the employee. If it is confirmed that irregularities exist in the investigation, which may directly affect the conclusions of the investigation (e.g. a past conflict between the employee and the investigator or the employee was unfairly treated in the investigation), the employer shall suspend the investigation and resume the investigation after timely resolution of such complaint. If the grievance does not affect the normal conduct of the investigation, the employer can still proceed with the investigation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The grievance may also have to be investigated (eg, moral/sexual harassment reported by an employee under investigation).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

In the context of private internal investigations, grievances initially raised by the employee do not usually have an impact on the investigation.

However, if the employer terminates the employment contract due to a justified legal complaint raised by an employee, a court might consider the termination to be abusive and award the employee compensation in an amount to be determined by the court but not exceeding six months' pay for the employee (article 336 paragraph 1 (lit. b) and article 337c paragraph 3, Swiss Code of Obligations). Furthermore, a termination by the employer may be challenged if it takes place without good cause following a complaint of discrimination by the employee to a superior or the initiation of proceedings before a conciliation board or a court by the employee (article 10, Federal Act on Gender Equality).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off sick during the investigation?



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

During the investigation, the employer should fully respect the basic labor rights of the employee. According to the relevant provisions of Labor Contract Law of the PRC, if an employee is sick during the investigation, the employer should permit him/her to take sick leave provided that he/she provides the medical certificate issued by the medical institution and performs the medical leave application procedure as required by the employer. Therefore, the employer usually needs to request the employee to cooperate with the investigation after the sick leave, and cannot force the investigation by means of coercion or violence.

However, for the contents that can be investigated by the employer alone, such as the information publicized by the employee on social media and the employee's relevant information publicized on official website, since the investigation of such information is not affected by the employee's physical condition, the employer may adjust the investigation plan and conduct such part of the investigation first.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The investigation will likely be able to continue with the other employees and, as soon as the employee under investigation returns from sick leave, they will be able to be interviewed.

However, as disciplinary sanctions are time-barred after two months from the moment the misconduct was committed or from when the employer becomes aware of it, if the sick leave lasts for the whole of that period, the investigation must be conducted anyway. In this instance, the investigator can ask the employee to attend the interview despite being on sick leave or arrange for the interview to take place using other means (eg, conference call). As a last resort, a questionnaire can be sent to the employee, but the pros and cons must be assessed as this is a way of information gathering that carries a certain amount of risk, could be less reliable and is of less probative value.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

The time spent on the internal investigation by the employee should be counted as working time^[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

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The PRC law is silent on how to deal with the conflict between internal investigation and criminal or regulatory investigation. In general, the employer should cooperate with the criminal or regulatory investigation being conducted by the investigating authority to avoid hindering official business.

According to the Civil Procedure Law of the PRC, the Administrative Procedure Law of the PRC, and the Criminal Procedure Law of the PRC, the investigating authorities (including the public security authority, the people's procuratorate, the people's court, and the supervision authority) have the power to investigate and verify evidence from the witness or the individuals or entities that have access to the evidentiary materials. Therefore, the investigating authorities have the power to compel the employer to share or provide evidentiary materials relating to the case, and the employer shall cooperate and provide such materials. If the employer refuses to cooperate, it may face administrative liability (such as warning, fine and detention of the directly responsible person), judicial liability (fine shall be imposed on the main person in charge or the directly responsible person, and detention may be granted to those who refuse to cooperate) and even criminal liability (those who conceal criminal evidence may be guilty of perjury).

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

A criminal investigation always takes precedence over other investigations. However, this does not mean that the internal investigation has to stop. It can and should continue, and the report drawn up upon completion of the investigation could be used by the authorities in the criminal investigation. In some cases, especially when privilege does not apply, police or regulatory authorities may request that the employer share such evidence. However, even when privilege does apply, there is no certainty that the evidence would not have to be communicated to certain authorities.

Some administrative authorities often challenge the application of legal privilege or try to reduce its scope. For example, the French financial markets authority (AMF) regularly puts forward its view of legal privilege, according to which an email where a lawyer is only copied (and is not one of the main recipients) in from one of their clients is not confidential and can therefore be disclosed in proceedings. However, if the AMF investigators impose disclosure of privileged documents, this should result in the annulment of the investigation procedure. By way of exception, legal privilege cannot be invoked against certain other authorities, such as the URSSAF (authority in charge of collecting social security contributions) or the DGCCRF (directorate-general for competition, consumer protection and anti-fraud investigations). Where legal privilege is enforceable, the judge must first determine whether the documents constitute correspondence relating to defence rights and, second, must cancel the seizure of documents that they find to be covered by legal privilege due to the principle of professional secrecy of relations between a lawyer and their client and the rights of defence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

The actions of the employer may carry through to a subsequent state proceeding. First and foremost, any prohibitions on the use of evidence must be considered. Whereas in civil proceedings the interest in establishing the truth must merely prevail for exploitation (article 152 paragraph 2, Swiss Civil Procedure Code), in criminal proceedings, depending on the nature of the unlawful act, there is a risk that the evidence may not be used (see question 27 and article 140 et seq, Swiss Civil Procedure Code).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

There is no explicit stipulation in the laws and regulations in the PRC on this issue. In practice, given the confidentiality of any investigation into a violation, the employer usually will not disclose the investigation result or submit the investigation report to the investigated employee, unless it is explicitly provided in its rules and regulations that the employer is obliged to inform the employee of the investigation result. However, according to the Employment Contract Law of the PRC and the opinions of the mainstream arbitration tribunals and courts, if an employer decides to take disciplinary action against an employee (in particular, termination of employment contract) according to the investigation result, it is generally required to inform the employee of the investigation result. In other words, the employer generally needs to inform the employee of the specific facts based on which the disciplinary action is taken. Failure to do so

may result in the generalization of serious violation of the employer's rules and regulations and lead the arbitration tribunals and courts to regard the termination as illegal.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation, like the other employees interviewed and the whistleblower, must be informed that the investigation has been completed. However, there is no obligation to provide them with the report and, for reasons of confidentiality, it is very often best not to do so.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

The employee's right to information based on article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection also covers the investigation report, provided that the report and the data contained therein relate to the employee.^[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. 394.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

For the employee: As mentioned in our response to question 22, the relevant laws and regulations in the PRC do not impose any obligation on an employer to share investigation report (including the findings) with

its employee, unless otherwise expressly provided in its internal rules and regulations that the employer may share with its employee any investigation report or findings that do not involve trade secrets or another person's privacy or personal information. Therefore, the employer has the discretion to decide whether and to what extent to share the investigation report based on its business management needs.

For the police/regulatory authorities: In general, an employer shall provide a complete report according to the law as required by the authority handling the case. It is recommended that the employer should conduct a detailed review of the investigation authority and the information contained in the evidence collection documents issued by the authority, and communicate with the authority to specify the scope of assistance and evidentiary materials to be provided. Although the employer cannot refuse to provide relevant evidentiary materials to the investigation authority on the grounds that such evidentiary materials involve trade secret or personal privacy, it still needs to carefully assess the relevance of the evidentiary materials to the facts of the case and timely communicate with the authority to confirm and narrow the scope of providing evidence as much as possible. If necessary, the employer can consult professional lawyers to provide professional opinions. In addition, we suggest that the employer may also try to require the investigation officer to sign a confidentiality letter, and file the investigation materials involving trade secret or personal privacy, the reasons thereof, etc., for the purpose of reducing legal risks faced by the employer.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

There is no obligation to share the investigation report. The findings, or a summary of them without revealing any confidential information, may be disclosed, but it is the employer's responsibility to keep the identity of every person interviewed confidential.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise based on data protection law vis-à-vis the persons concerned (eg, the accused). Likewise, there is no obligation to disclose other documents, such as the records of interviews. The employee should be fully informed of the final investigation report, if necessary, with certain redactions (see question 22). The right of the employee concerned to information is comprehensive (ie, all investigation files must be disclosed to him).^[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.^[2]

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, in: HR Today, to be found on: <Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten | hrtoday.ch> (last visited on 27 June 2022).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The employer may take disciplinary actions against the employee based on the investigation result and pursue their civil, administrative and even criminal liabilities. To be specific: 1) the employer may criticize and educate the employee, or take disciplinary actions such as warning, demotion and removal according to the internal rules and regulations of the employer. If the misconduct of the employee constitutes one of the circumstances stipulated in Article 39 of the Employment Contract Law of the PRC, the employer is entitled to take the most severe disciplinary action, namely termination of employment contract; 2) if the employee has caused economic loss to the employer, the employer may lawfully initiate a civil litigation recourse procedure; 3) if the employee violates the Law on Administrative Penalties for Public Security Administration of the PRC, the employer may deliver the case to the administrative department for corresponding administrative penalties; 4) if the employee is suspected of a crime, the employer should deliver the case to the public security authority and pursue his/her corresponding criminal liabilities according to the law.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employer can decide to sanction the person who was under investigation or to close the case. The employer may also need to protect any victims, witnesses and whistleblowers. If, during the investigation, it is discovered that a supplier or other commercial partner is implicated, the relevant contract may be terminated. The employer can take legal action, file a complaint (if the company is a direct victim of a criminal offence) or report the offence to the public prosecutor's office. The employer must archive the file or ensure its lawful preservation after a certain period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

25. Who can (or must) the investigation findings be disclosed to? Does that include regulators/police? Can the interview records be kept private, or are they at risk of disclosure?



China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

If the relevant investigation authorities or regulatory authorities require the employer to provide the investigation findings and the interview records of its employee's illegal activities, the employer is usually obliged to cooperate with the authorities and make disclosures according to the requirements of the law. Meanwhile, according to Article 110 of the Criminal Procedure Law of the PRC, any entity or individual who has found out facts of a crime or a criminal suspect has both the right and the duty to report the case or provide information to the public security authority, the people's procuratorate or the people's court. Therefore, if the investigation findings show that the employee is suspected of a crime, the employer should disclose the information to the relevant investigation authorities including the public security authority. For some special industries, for example, the investigation findings against the banking industry usually also need to be reported to the higher-level banking supervisory authorities. Although the relevant investigation staff and supervisory staff are usually required to comply with the confidentiality obligations according to the laws or regulations, the risk of leakage of the reported information due to the expansion of the scope of persons who are aware of the investigation findings cannot be completely excluded.

In addition, an employer may decide whether to disclose the results of an investigation (mainly including the violation of disciplines and the disciplinary punishment) to other employees at its own discretion, but has to disclose the relevant information among employees to the extent that it is "minimum and necessary", so as to avoid infringing on the employee's personal information or privacy or even right of reputation.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The findings must be submitted to the employer or management, but there is no obligation to disclose them to anybody else. The only exception is if a judicial investigation has been opened. In this case, the entire report must be provided to the authorities if the judge requests this. Normally the investigators only take written notes and there is no audio or video recording, unless the employee consents. Whether or not to make a voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing is a tactical decision for companies. Disclosure may mitigate fines and penalties or even help the employer avoid liability entirely. However, the downsides of disclosure include increased costs, the possibility of a follow-on government investigation and exposure to penalties. Thus, most companies assess their options on a case-by-case basis to determine what steps would be in the best interests of the company.

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 Romerio/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), *Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen*, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 123.

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

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

The relevant laws and regulations in the PRC have not clarified the retention period of the investigation findings. According to Article 19 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC, unless otherwise required by laws or administrative regulations, the retention period of personal information shall be the shortest period necessary to achieve the purpose of handling the information. Since the employee's personal information is very likely to be involved in the investigation findings, such report should be retained for the shortest period necessary to achieve the purpose of handling the information. In general, once the investigation is completed, the purpose of the internal investigation has been achieved or it is no longer necessary to achieve the purpose, and the employer may, in accordance with Article 22 of the Administrative Regulations of the PRC on Network Data Security (Draft for Comments), delete or anonymize the personal information within fifteen (15) working days. If it is technically difficult to delete the personal information, or it is difficult to do so within fifteen (15) working days due to business complexity or other reasons, the employer shall not conduct any processing other than storing the personal information and adopting necessary security measures, and shall give reasonable explanations to the employee.

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

If the outcome of the internal investigation has led to the sanctioning of an employee, this sanction may no longer be invoked to support a new sanction after three years. Moreover, under the GDPR principles, the duration of retention must be proportional to the use of the data. Therefore, the data must be retained only for a period that is “strictly necessary and proportionate”. If the employer wants to keep information about the investigation in the longer term, it is possible to archive the employee’s record even though the employer will no longer be able to use it against the employee after three years.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

It is inevitable that the investigation involves the employee's personal information, and once the investigation is mishandled, the employer may face the following legal risks:

Civil liability: Both the Civil Code of the PRC and the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC, clearly provide the civil liability for infringement of privacy and illegal processing of personal information.

Therefore, the investigated employee or relevant organizations such as the people's procuratorate have the

right to claim or file a public interest lawsuit on the employer's improper collection of evidence, requiring the employer to bear the liability for infringement. In addition, the evidence obtained by an employer through infringing the employee's privacy and personal information rights and interests, in violation of the law, cannot be used as the valid evidence for the employer's unilateral termination of the employment contract or requiring the employee to compensate for losses.

Administrative liability: Article 66 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC provides that, where personal information is processed in violation of regulations, administrative penalties imposed by the department performing duties of personal information protection may be up to revoking the business license, and the person directly in charge and other directly liable persons may be fined up to one million yuan and prohibited from practicing within a time limit. Meanwhile, Article 67 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC provides that relevant illegal acts shall be recorded in the employer's credit files and disclosed to the public.

Criminal liability: if an employer illegally sells or provides to others the personal information obtained during the internal investigation, and the circumstance is serious enough, the judicial authority has the right to hold the employer, the managers directly in charge and other directly liable persons criminally liable in accordance with the crime of "infringement of citizens' personal information" under Article 253A of the Criminal Law of the PRC.

It should be noted that a compliance investigation may also involve the employer's communication and investigation reporting with overseas authorities, or overseas institutions' direct access to information from the employer's domestic systems. If the employer conducts cross-border transmission of such personal information, it shall also meet one of the conditions set out in Article 38 of the Personal Information Protection Law of the PRC (i.e. passing the security assessment organized by the national cyberspace administration authority, obtaining certification from a professional institution concerning the protection of personal information or entering into a standard contract with an overseas recipient). Violations of the above provisions may result in civil, administrative and even criminal liability.

Last updated on 29/11/2023



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

But, for example, unwarranted surveillance could conceivably result in criminal liability (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code) for violations of the employee's privacy. Furthermore, errors made by the employer

could have an impact on any later criminal proceedings (eg, in the form of prohibitions on the use of evidence).[1]

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

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

[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

[5] Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 6B_1241/2016 dated 17. July 2017 consid. 1.2.2; Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 1B_22/2012 dated 11 May 2012 consid. 2.4.4.

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



China

Leo Yu
Yvonne Gao
Tracy Liu
Larry Lian
Jingtian & Gongcheng



France

Pascale Lagesse
Valentino Armillei
Bredin Prat



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com