

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There is no specific law governing workplace investigations in Brazil, but Law 14.457/2022 states that companies must have rules that relate to sexual and other forms of harassment in their internal policies, address the rules for receiving and processing accusations, assess the facts, and discipline any individuals directly and indirectly involved in acts of sexual harassment or violence.

If the investigation has any connection with anticorruption matters, the investigation procedure must comply with Law 12846/2013 (Brazilian Anticorruption Act) and Decree 8420/2015.

As a result, Brazilian employers usually follow the rules determined by internal corporate policies, which often result from international regulations and principles that differ from the Brazilian ones, which inadvertently expose the Brazilian subsidiary to liability. The answers below will highlight common examples of this, when appropriate.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

In Greece, workplace investigations are not heavily regulated.

However, internal disciplinary procedures are governed by certain general principles, while there is also legislation regulating certain aspects of investigations opened in the context of whistleblowing procedures or concerning complaints for workplace violence or harassment. These include Law 4990/2022, which transposed EU Directive 2019/1937 into Greek Law; and Law 4808/2021, which ratified the ILO's Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No190) and introduced relevant provisions.

As far as disciplinary procedures in private-sector companies are concerned, employers that must have internal labour regulations in place (ie, those with more than 70 employees) or opt to adopt them

voluntarily, can regulate the procedures themselves.

In the public sector, internal investigations are governed by disciplinary provisions included in the civil servant code.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The Employment Ordinance (EO), which is the primary legislation governing employment relationships in Hong Kong, does not provide for a statutory workplace investigation procedure.

The Labour Department of Hong Kong has, however, published a Guide to Good People Management Practices^[1] which recommends that employers lay down rules of conduct, grievance and disciplinary procedures. Such rules should be simple and clear, logical and fair, and in line with the provisions in the EO.

As part of risk management and internal controls, Hong Kong-listed companies are expected by The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited (SEHK) to establish whistleblowing policies and systems for employees to raise concerns about possible improprieties with independent board members. Listed companies are also expected to establish policies for the promotion and support of anti-corruption laws and regulations. Such policies and systems may include workplace investigation procedures.^[2] If a listed company chooses to not establish such policies and systems, it is required to explain how it could achieve appropriate and effective risk management and internal controls.

[1] Hong Kong Labour Department, "Guide to Good People Management Practices" (June 2019)
<<https://www.labour.gov.hk/eng/public/wcp/practice.pdf>>.

[2] SEHK, Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited, Appendix 14, Provision D.2.6, D.2.7. SEHK, "Corporate Governance Guide for Boards and Directors" (December 2021)
<https://www.hkex.com.hk/-/media/HKEX-Market/Listing/Rules-and-Guidance/Corporate-Governance-Practices/guide_board_dir.pdf>.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

There is no specific legal regulation for internal investigations in Switzerland. The legal framework is derived from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights. Depending on the context of the investigation, additional legal provisions may apply; for instance, additional provisions of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection or the Swiss Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually

commenced?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Workplace investigations usually commence on the receipt of an allegation, which can be presented orally or in writing to an assigned member of the company (usually, within the HR, Compliance or Legal Departments, or to a direct supervisor) or via an external channel, as determined by the company's policy.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Internal investigations can be initiated either upon a complaint or report by an employee, (or other persons providing services or seeking employment, etc) in the workplace or by the employer as part of their managerial right.

If from an employee, the complaint or report may fall within the scope of an internal disciplinary procedure, if any, or may concern an alleged workplace violence or harassment incident, or fall within the scope of L.4990/2022 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law.

Reports by whistleblowers are submitted to the manager with responsibility for receiving and monitoring reports, a person appointed for that purpose under L.4990/2022. Complaints for incidents and harassment in the workplace can also be submitted, according to L.4808/2022, to the person or internal body specifically assigned to receive such complaints. Both laws require the employer to define the persons competent for receiving and monitoring complaints or reports and notifying the employees *stricto sensu* and any other persons falling within the scope of the respective provisions.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The circumstances in which an employer commences a workplace investigation may vary. However, it is common that an employer will consider it necessary to commence a workplace investigation upon receipt of a complaint concerning a fellow employee. Sometimes, the complaint may be made anonymously. If the employer considers there to be substance in the complaint, it may commence an investigation to find out the truth of the matter, resolve the complaint and, if necessary, improve its systems and controls to prevent the reoccurrence of any misconduct.

A workplace investigation may be warranted if the employer receives an enquiry from a regulator concerning its affairs or an employee's conduct. The investigation findings could enable the employer to respond to the regulator (which could be a mandatory obligation) and at the same time assess its risk exposure.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

For an internal investigation to be initiated, there must be a reasonable suspicion (grounds).^[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)?

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Yes, an employee can be suspended during or before a workplace investigation. However, suspending an employee is not a legal requirement in Brazil. It is also not standard business practice and entails legal risk, as detailed below.

While internal policies in line with a company's global investigation approach may determine whether investigated employees are suspended during an investigation, the suspension of an accused employee is not recommended. The only exception is when the accused employee, upon becoming aware of the existence of the investigation, poses a clear and imminent risk of physical danger to other employees or interfering with the investigation.

The suspension of an employee during an investigation makes it difficult for the company to keep the investigation confidential, because the absence of the investigated employee will have to be explained to his or her colleagues and business contacts. As a result, the investigated employee may be exposed to the stigma of being associated with potential misconduct.

Even if the accusation is confirmed and the individual is terminated with cause, the employer cannot disclose the reason for the termination or that the contract was terminated for a cause or violation in the employee's employment records. Also, if the employer shares such information with prospective employers they may be liable for damages.

Termination for cause on the grounds of dishonest conduct, if not upheld by the labour court, usually leads to liability for damages to the former employee due to the accusation and the stigma associated with it.

Therefore, if the company decides to suspend the employee during the investigation and terminate his or her employment at the end of the investigation, the suspension will be associated with wrongdoing, and the individual will have grounds to claim damages for the association between the termination, the investigation and wrongdoing, which will likely be presumed by a labour court (damage *in re ipsa*).

On the other hand, if the accusation is deemed groundless, the connection between the employee and potential wrongdoing resulting from his or her suspension can be used as grounds for damages because of the resulting environment at the workplace or the development of mental health conditions such as depression or anxiety by the investigated employee due to the investigation and uncertainty about the negative effect of it on his or her reputation.

Because suspension during an investigation is not a disciplinary measure, if the company decides to suspend, the employee's salary cannot be affected. Also, the suspension period must be as short as possible, and can in no circumstance be longer than 30 days. If it exceeds 30 days, it would trigger termination for cause by the company, which increases the amount of statutory severance due to the employee.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Internal labour regulations may allow for the suspension of an employee when there is reasonable suspicion that a disciplinary offence has been committed. Given that under Greek law employees have the right to receive wages and to be employed, suspension without a specific provision in the internal labour regulation may only be imposed in an extreme case where the offence and the risk of keeping the employee employed during an investigation is obvious.

Payment of remuneration during suspension should not be withheld, otherwise, the suspension could be considered a disciplinary penalty not provided in law and imposed without completion of the disciplinary procedure, thus illegally harming the employee.

In any case, suspension is one of the ultimate measures that may be taken, in contrast to, for example, a change of work position.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

It may be appropriate to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation, for instance, where the investigation has revealed misconduct on his or her part (even on a preliminary basis), or his or her continued presence in the business would hinder the progress of the investigation. However, the employer will have to consider the relevant legislative provisions and the terms of the employment contract before making any decision on suspension.

Under section 11 of the EO, an employer may suspend an employee without pay pending a decision as to whether the employee should be summarily dismissed (up to 14 days) or pending the outcome of any criminal proceedings against the employee arising out of his or her employment (up to the conclusion of the

criminal proceedings). If an employee is suspended as above, however, the employee may terminate his or her employment without notice or payment in lieu of notice.

It is more common for an employer to suspend an employee with pay during an investigation concerning his or her conduct rather than exercising its statutory right as mentioned above. This could avoid an unnecessary dispute with the employee concerned. Indeed, it is common for employers to include in employment contracts specific provisions to give themselves the right to suspend an employee with pay in certain circumstances. The provisions normally set out the circumstances in which the employer may exercise the right, the maximum period of suspension and other arrangements during the suspension period (eg, how the employee's entitlements under the employment contract are to be dealt with).

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There is no statutory rule, and therefore the investigator can be chosen by the company.

In sensitive matters, it is recommended that attorneys undertake the investigation due to legal privilege. Engaging external lawyers increases the confidence of witnesses and parties in the independence and lack of bias of the investigation process, especially when the allegations involve senior employees.

Additionally, attorneys are trained to collect information based on legal thresholds that apply to the allegations, allowing the decision-makers to understand the events as they would be posed before a labour judge or a prosecutor, and enabling them to clearly assess the legal risk involved in the situation.

Last updated on 14/09/2023

Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

As far as the persons in charge of an internal investigation are concerned, L. 4990/2022 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law provides for certain conditions that should be met when exercising their duties (ie, being impartial and abstaining when there is a conflict of interest), which also apply as general principles in all disciplinary procedures. Whistleblowing legislation stipulates that persons appointed to receive and investigate a whistleblowing procedure should meet certain conditions, including no penal proceedings against them, no disciplinary proceedings or convictions for specific offences, and no workplace suspensions.

Official disciplinary procedures are conducted by the competent bodies as described in the respective internal labour regulations.

Although not specifically regulated, support from external advisors (eg, lawyers) is allowed.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

There are no statutory or regulatory requirements regarding the choice of investigator in workplace investigations. However, it is good practice to have the investigation conducted by persons who have been trained to do so as investigations may involve intricate issues. It is also important that the investigators are perceived to be impartial and fair. For that reason, the investigators should be individuals who are not involved in the matter under investigation.

Complex cases or cases that involve a senior employee may require someone more senior within the company to lead and oversee the conduct of the investigation. This also applies where it is foreseeable that the investigation may lead to disciplinary action, summary dismissal of the employee or a report to an authority.

Engagement of external parties or professional advisors may be necessary if the conduct under investigation is serious or widespread and may lead to regulatory consequences, or if the employer does not have the requisite expertise to handle the investigation. Lawyers (whether in-house counsel or external lawyers) may be the best fit to conduct a workplace investigation to ensure that legal professional privilege attaches to documents and communications created during the investigation (please see question 14).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

The examinations can be carried out internally by designated internal employees, by external specialists, or by a combination thereof. The addition of external advisors is particularly recommended if the allegations are against an employee of a high hierarchical level^[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.

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Employees are not legally prohibited from bringing legal action, but because investigations are within an employer's powers, a legal action to broadly stop an investigation (as opposed to an injunction to prevent a limited measure within an investigation, such as the review of private messages) would likely be deemed groundless.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Although there is no specific legal provision, access to legal action and judicial proceedings cannot be obstructed under any circumstances as this is a fundamental right under the Greek constitution. Thus, if an employee manages to bring legal action to stop the investigation (eg, a prolonged investigation for a frivolous complaint harms them), then the investigation may have to be temporarily paused or permanently terminated depending on the court decision.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the investigation is conducted in a manner that is contrary to an express term of the employment contract or the implied obligation of trust and confidence of the employer under common law (please see question 11), the employee may have a claim for breach of contract and possible remedies may include declaratory and injunctive relief against the investigation.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Employees cannot be compelled to act as witnesses. Employers may have trouble enforcing internal policies stating that employees who refuse to participate in investigations will be disciplined (warned, suspended or have their contract terminated for cause), but can terminate their contract without cause.

There are no explicit legal protections for employees acting as witnesses, but it is common best practice to have witnesses' identities protected to the extent necessary for the investigation, and to protect them from retaliation.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Indirectly involved employees may be interviewed as witnesses in the context of the investigation, as the employee has a duty of loyalty towards the employer originating from the employment relationship. However, they cannot be forced to do so (in contrast with criminal procedures). Any harmful act that could be considered retaliation against witnesses in the context of violence or harassment or whistleblowing investigation is prohibited. In addition, the identity of any employees as witnesses is also covered by the principle of confidentiality.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Under Hong Kong law, the employee has an implied duty to obey lawful instructions from his or her employer and to serve the employer with fidelity and good faith during the term of his or her employment. A lawful instruction from an employer may include a reasonable request for the employee to participate and provide information in the workplace investigation. If the employee refuses to comply with such instruction or is obstructive or provides untrue or misleading information, it could constitute a ground for summary dismissal under the EO and at common law.

That said, in general terms, an employer should not compel any employee to testify against a co-worker,

particularly if such a co-worker is a senior colleague, as evidence provided under compulsion may not be helpful to the investigation.

Employees who act as witnesses must be treated as per their contractual and statutory rights, including the right against self-incrimination. If the investigation involves allegations of discrimination on the ground of sex, race or disability, the employer should ensure that the witnesses will not be victimised or treated less favourably than other employees.

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 [hrtday.ch](https://www.hrtday.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 [hrtday.ch](https://www.hrtday.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?

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

The Brazilian General Data Protection Law (LGPD) does not have specific rules or principles that apply to internal investigations conducted within private organisations. Despite that, the general principles and obligations set forth by the LGPD apply to any processing of personal data carried out within the context of such investigations. As a result, the company must ensure the transparency of such processing activities through a privacy notice addressed to the data subjects; only process the personal data that is necessary for the investigation; define the lawful basis that applies to such processing activities (especially for

sensitive data); and apply any other obligations established by the LGPD.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

GDPR and the provisions of L. 4624/2019 regulate the gathering of physical evidence from a data protection perspective, providing, among other things, that personal data should be processed with transparency and to the extent necessary for the investigation.

L.4990/2022 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law regulates data protection issues in the context of whistleblowing investigations, mainly to safeguard confidentiality throughout the investigations.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If physical evidence contains data relating to an individual, from which the identity of the individual can be ascertained,^[1] the data would constitute personal data under the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486) (PDPO). The PDPO sets out several data protection principles that the employer must comply with while processing personal data, including:^[2]

- personal data must be collected for a lawful purpose related to a function or activity of the employer and should not be excessive for this purpose. An internal investigation would be regarded as a lawful purpose;
- personal data must be accurate and not kept longer than is necessary;
- personal data must not be used for a purpose other than the internal investigation (or other purposes for which the data was collected) unless the employee consents to a new use or the new use falls within one of the exceptions provided in the PDPO;
- personal data must be safeguarded against unauthorised or accidental access, processing or loss; and
- the employee whose personal data has been collected has the right to request access to and correction of his or her personal data retained by the employer.

If an employer wants to gather evidence through employee monitoring, it should ensure that the act of monitoring complies with the data protection principles of the PDPO if the monitoring activity would amount to the collection of personal data. The Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data has issued guidelines to employers on the steps they can take in assessing whether employee monitoring is appropriate for their businesses.^[3] As a general rule, employee monitoring should be conducted overtly. Further, those who may be affected should be notified in advance of the purposes the monitoring is intended to serve, the circumstances in which the system will be activated, what personal data (if any) will be collected and how the personal data will be used.

Covert surveillance of employees should not be adopted unless it is justified by relevant special circumstances. Employers should consider whether there is reason to believe that there is an unlawful activity taking place and the use of overt monitoring would likely prejudice the detection or collection of evidence.^[4] Even if covert monitoring is justified, it should target only those areas in which an unlawful activity is likely to take place and be implemented for a limited duration of time.

[1] PDPO section 2.

[2] PDPO Schedule 1.

[3] PCPD, "Privacy Guidelines: Monitoring and Personal Data Privacy at Work" (April 2016) <https://www.pcpd.org.hk/english/data_privacy_law/code_of_practices/files/Monitoring_and_Personal_Data_Privacy_At_Work_revis_Eng.pdf>.

[4] Ibid at paragraph 2.3.3.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

No; employers are only generally allowed to search the work tools they provide to employees, such as company mobile phones, electronic files, and company email and other electronic communications.

However, they may also request that employees turn over any company documents in their possession.

Searches of employees' private possessions or files during an investigation can only occur with the verifiable consent of the employee.

Last updated on 14/09/2023

Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

As a first step, the employer should ask for the employee's permission to access their possessions and files. Employment contracts and internal labour regulations may include provisions regarding an employer's access to employees' documents created and kept for business purposes or related to business activity.

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

As part of an investigation, an employer may search objects or files that are the company's property (eg, electronic devices given by the employer for business purposes and emails or messages stored on the company's server) without prior notice and the employee's consent is not needed. The employer, however, has no right to search an employee's possessions (eg, a private smartphone) without the employee's consent.

To avoid arguments as to who a particular object belongs to, employers may specify in internal policies what is to be regarded as a corporate asset and could be subject to a search in a workplace investigation.

Concerning an employee's possessions, even if he or she consents to a search, it is good practice for the employer to conduct the search in the presence of the employee or an independent third party who can act as a witness to the search. If the employer suspects that a criminal offence has been committed and that a search of the employee's possessions would reveal evidence, the employer should consider reporting its suspicion to the police, as they have wider legal powers to search.^[1]

^[1] Usually upon execution of a warrant.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Switzerland

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

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

If there is a strong suspicion of criminal conduct on the part of the employee and a sufficiently strong justification exists, a search of private data may be justified.^[1] The factual connection with the employment relationship is given, for example, in the case of a criminal act committed during working

hours or using workplace infrastructure.[\[2\]](#)

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

[\[2\]](#) Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 168 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

If the investigation involves matters within the scope of a specific whistleblowing policy, the policy rules should prevail against the general investigation rules if there is a conflict.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

L. 4990/2022 includes specific requirements regarding, among other things, the procedure of receiving and investigating respective reports, confidentiality issues (especially regarding the identity of the whistleblower), data protection issues (including restrictions to the right of access) and the employer's right to keep a record of the relevant complaint and investigation. Such provisions are expected to be further detailed by Ministerial Decisions in future.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Hong Kong does not have a comprehensive legislative framework relating to whistleblowing. Therefore, in general, employers are free to establish whistleblowing policies and procedures and confer such protections on whistleblowers as they see fit. That said, companies listed on the Main Board of the SEHK are expected to establish a whistleblowing policy and system for employees to voice concerns anonymously about possible improprieties in the companies' affairs. If a listed issuer deviates from this practice, it must explain the deviation.[\[1\]](#)

When an investigation involves whistleblowing, the employer needs to comply with the relevant policy and

system and provide the whistleblower with such protections as stated in the policy. The employer should not ignore a complaint simply because it was made anonymously, and should ascertain the substance of the complaint to decide whether a full-blown investigation is warranted.

In addition, the employer should seek to establish a secure communication channel with the whistleblower to gather more information about the complaint or misconduct while maintaining the confidentiality of his or her identity. If the complaint is serious, the employer may consider referring the complaint to a law enforcement agency or regulator as they would be better placed in protecting the anonymity of the whistleblower while proceeding with the investigation. That said, employers generally have no obligation to report internal wrongdoing to any external body (please see question 25 for exceptions). The employer may assess whether it is appropriate to do so on a case-by-case basis.

[1] The Corporate Governance Code, Appendix 14 of the Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Law 14.457/2022 states that companies must guarantee the anonymity of accusers. As a result, it is best practice that companies allow for anonymous submissions, or allow accusers to voluntarily disclose their identity while acknowledging that they agree that it will be kept confidential to the extent required by the investigation.

Also, companies should have internal rules stating that all parties involved in an investigation (accusing party, accused party, witnesses, investigators, and any other person that has any contact with the investigation) must keep the existence of the investigation and of the events related to the investigation confidential to the extent required by the investigation, and discipline any individuals that violate this.

Last updated on 14/09/2023

Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Confidentiality applies as a general principle in disciplinary investigations.

Moreover, L. 4990/2022, which transposed EU Directive 2019/1937 into Greek Law, regulates the issue of confidentiality during investigations that start based on an internal report. The managers conducting the investigation must respect and abide by the rules of confidentiality regarding the information they have become aware of when exercising their duties[1]. They must also protect the complainant's and any third party's (referred to in the report) confidentiality by preventing unauthorised persons from accessing the report[2].

Finally, L. 4808/2021 provides that employers must create a procedure that should be communicated to employees regarding all the necessary steps of an investigation following a complaint. Throughout the whole process, the employer, managers and the employer's representatives responsible for the investigation must respect and abide by the rules of confidentiality in a manner that safeguards the dignity and personal data of the complainant and the person under investigation[3].

[1] Law 4990/2022, art. 9 par.8(b)

[2] Law 4990/2022, art. 10 par. 2(e)

[3] Law 4808/2021 art. 5 par.1(a) and 10 par.2(b)

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Workplace investigations should usually be conducted on a confidential basis to preserve the integrity of the investigation, avoid cross-contamination of evidence and maintain the confidentiality of the employee under investigation. This means that those involved in the investigation (ie, the subject employee and any material witnesses) should be made aware of the fact and substance of the investigation on a need-to-know basis.

While the extent of the confidentiality obligations are usually governed by the employer's internal policies and the employment contract, there are circumstances where the employer has a statutory duty to keep information unearthed in the investigation confidential. For instance, if it is found that certain property represents proceeds of an indictable offence[1] or drug trafficking[2], or is terrorist property[3], the employer should report its knowledge or suspicion to the Joint Financial Intelligence Unit (JFIU) as soon as is reasonably practicable and avoid disclosure to any other person as such disclosure may constitute "tipping off". Another example is if a workplace investigation is commenced in response to a regulatory enquiry, the employer may be bound by a statutory secrecy obligation and may not be at liberty to disclose anything about the regulatory enquiry to anyone including those who are subject to the workplace investigation. For example, section 378 of the Securities and Futures Ordinance (SFO) imposes such a secrecy obligation on anyone who is under investigation or assists the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) in an investigation.[4]

[1] OSCO section 25A(5). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine of \$500,000 and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of \$100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[2] DTROPO section 25A(1). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine of \$500,000 and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of \$100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[3] UNATMO section 12(1). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction to a fine and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of \$100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[4] A person who fails to maintain secrecy is liable upon conviction on indictment to a maximum fine of \$1 million and imprisonment for up to two years (or upon summary conviction, to a maximum fine of \$100,000 and imprisonment for up to six months).

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There is no obligation to inform an employee under investigation that this is the case, and it should not happen automatically.

While some policies require that the investigated employee be informed about the allegations against them at the beginning of the investigation, from a local perspective it is recommended that the accused employee be notified about the existence of the allegations if, after a reasonable review, there are elements that suggest that the accusation may be material.

In this context, the employee should be informed about the accusation and be allowed to confirm, deny, provide further context or justify each reported or identified event; offer evidence; and indicate persons or sources of information that could corroborate his or her defence. Information about the accusation must be focused on facts rather than on how the company obtained the information.

If the accusation is found to be groundless after initial review, involving the accused employee at the beginning of the process may have triggered unjust and unnecessary stress and a disruption in the employment relationship that may not be satisfactorily repaired by a determination that the accusation was void. This may result in a legal liability for the company or HR issues that could otherwise have been avoided.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

As a matter of general principle, employees under investigation must have access to the necessary information to be able to defend themselves, in the context of their fundamental right to a fair trial and hearing.

Moreover, from a data protection perspective, they may be entitled to access their personal data in the respective files.

The above rights must be balanced with confidentiality and the need to safeguard the completion of the investigation and to protect the complainant from retaliation.

According to L.4990/2022, all data and information as well as the identity of the complainant are confidential, and any disclosure is only permitted where required by the EU or national legislation or during court proceedings, and only if it is necessary for the protection of the defence rights of the employee under investigation. The section of L.4808/2021 for the elimination of workplace violence and harassment does not regulate this specifically but provides a general obligation for confidentiality.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

An employer's internal policies or the employment contract may provide that an employee under investigation should be given certain information concerning the allegations raised against him or her. Such policies or terms should be followed and failure to do so may result in a claim for breach of contract or constructive dismissal by the employee. Even where there are no express provisions, the employer still

owes an implied obligation of trust and confidence towards the employee at common law, which requires the employer not to, without reasonable and proper cause, conduct itself in a manner calculated and likely to destroy or seriously damage the relationship of confidence and trust between itself and the employee.^[1] In the context of an internal investigation, the implied duty would require the employer to conduct the investigation and reach its findings reasonably and rationally following the evidence available and in good faith. This would normally require that sufficient information about the allegations made against the employee be provided to him or her such that he or she has the opportunity to properly respond to the allegations before any disciplinary action is taken or any decision about his or her employment is made.

^[1] Malik v Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA (In Liquidation) [1998] AC 20.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Yes, the identity of the complainant, witnesses and sources of information for the investigation should be kept confidential.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

According to express provisions of L.4990/2020, in principle personal data and any other information that may lead directly or indirectly to the identification of the complainant must not be disclosed to anyone other than the investigating individuals unless the complainant gives consent^[4] and that is why pseudonyms should be used. The witnesses and third persons that aid the complainant are deemed as “mediators” by the Law and their contribution to the procedure should be confidential^[5].

L.4808/2021 does not indicate when such disclosures are permitted; however, it is obvious that this is a matter of cost-benefit analysis where the public interest and the fundamental rights of the involved persons should be considered in a balanced way to ensure the best results. From a data protection perspective, it could be argued that the person under investigation’s right to know the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information should be limited to protect the rights of these persons.

[4] Law 4990/2022 art.14 par.1

[5] Law 4990/2022, art.3 par. 7 and art.10 par.2(e)

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Subject to any internal policies and terms of the employment contract, an employer would have discretion as to whether the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information for the investigation should be kept confidential. In general, the employer should consider how the confidential treatment or its absence would affect the conduct and outcome of the investigation. The disclosure of the identity of the complainant in some cases may be necessary for the employee under investigation to respond in a meaningful way. On the other hand, both the complainant and witnesses may be more forthcoming in providing information if he or she is assured that his or her identity will not be made known to the person under investigation (especially if the latter is senior management personnel). A balance should be struck between the interests of the complainant or witnesses in maintaining confidentiality and the need for the employee under investigation to make a proper response to the allegations made. In any case, the employer should follow its whistleblowing policy if there is one (as discussed in question 9), and take into account practical and statutory considerations relating to confidentiality (as discussed in question 10).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Yes, NDAs may be executed to reinforce the confidentiality obligations outlined in the company's policies and reinforced in interviews.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

NDAs are an option, especially to outline in detail the obligations of the persons conducting the investigation, which is also provided for in law. On the other hand, NDAs will not prevent persons involved from providing information to the competent authorities in the context of criminal or other similar procedures, where they must do so by law. Moreover, they may not protect confidentiality if persons who report breaches of Union law decide to make an external or public report, according to the provisions of L. 4990/2022.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

In general terms, NDAs can be used and indeed are commonly used to keep the fact and substance of a workplace investigation confidential. However, NDAs will not be effective in preventing the disclosure of information which is in the public interest or is important for safeguarding public welfare in matters of health and safety. Further, several laws in Hong Kong provide that disclosures as a result of compliance with a requirement made by the relevant authorities will not be treated as a breach of any restriction imposed by contract or otherwise by law.[\[1\]](#)

[\[1\]](#) The Drug Trafficking (Recovery of Proceeds) Ordinance (Cap. 405), the Organized and Serious Crimes Ordinance (Cap. 455), and the United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance (Cap. 575)

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Privilege attaches to investigation materials when attorneys conduct interviews and take notes, and when they write reports and recommendations.

However, if other persons participate in an interview or write a report, and they are not attorneys, they can be required to testify about what they witnessed while participating in the interview or to discuss or disclose their investigation report.

For this reason, when starting an investigation, and depending on the matters to be investigated, it is important to determine whether it is convenient to allocate lawyers to certain roles to increase the company's control of corporate confidentiality resulting from third-party involvement in the investigation.

Attorneys should also clearly state to participants of the investigation that they are attorneys representing the company and that their work papers fall under attorney-client privilege and will not be shared with them.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Regarding L.4990/2022 for whistleblowers' procedures, many categories of privilege may occur during an investigation, such as: attorney-client privilege; doctor-patient privilege; and court or other proceedings' privilege deemed as classified. L.4990/2022 provides that its provisions do not affect any of these privileges and these privileges supersede^[6].

Privilege may also be attached to investigation materials in investigations relating to workplace harassment and violence incidents; however, since L.4808/2021 does not offer a specific provision and criminal proceedings may also commence, the matter of privilege must be examined ad hoc.

^[6] Law 4990/2022 art.5 par.2(b) and par.2(c)

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Legal professional privilege may attach to investigation materials if they are generated for the sole or dominant purpose of giving or obtaining legal advice (legal advice privilege); or created with the sole or dominant purpose of either obtaining or giving advice about or obtaining evidence to be used in an actual or reasonably contemplated litigation (litigation privilege).^[1] Legal advice privilege applies to confidential

communications between lawyers and their clients, whereas litigation privilege may extend to communications between lawyers, clients and third parties. The employer may withhold disclosure of any materials that are subject to either legal advice or litigation privilege.

In the context of a workplace investigation, internal interview records are protected by legal advice privilege if the dominant purpose of creating those records is to seek legal advice on potential disciplinary action against the employee. Such interview records are protected by litigation privilege if they are created to obtain evidence in an actual or reasonably contemplated litigation.

It should be noted that the point in time at which the sole or dominant purpose is judged is when the document is created. In other words, a document is not covered by litigation privilege if it was not created for litigation purposes but was subsequently used to obtain legal advice for litigation.^[2] On a practical point, if the employer would like to minimise disclosure of the investigation by claiming privilege over relevant materials, it may wish to limit the number of documents created and persons to which they are circulated to avoid potential waiver of privilege.

^[1] White Book 2023, 24/5/16, 24/5/18; Litigation privilege applies to adversarial proceedings, but not inquisitorial or administrative proceedings (White Book 2023, 24/5/28).

^[2] White Book 2023, 24/5/18.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

^[1] Claudia M. Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz*, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 284 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

during the investigation?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Legally, a minor or someone with limited mental capacity must be represented by his or her parents or legal guardian in a meeting at work. Besides that, employers are not legally required to allow any external person to accompany employees during investigations, since these are internal proceedings and, generally, employee participation should be voluntary and not subject to retaliation, including if the employee refuses to participate.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Greek law does not specifically regulate the right to be accompanied or have legal representation during internal investigations for private-sector employees.

However, the right to legal representation established in article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights could be interpreted to cover cases such as internal investigations in the workplace. In addition, according to article 136 of Civil Servant Code, the employee under investigation has the right to be represented by an attorney at law. There is an additional argument regarding private-sector employees and their right to legal representation, by applying this provision by analogy.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Absent any right conferred by the employment contract or the relevant internal policy, employees do not have a right under Hong Kong law to be accompanied or have legal representation during an investigation meeting or interview. While the employee being investigated is entitled to seek his or her own legal advice during the investigation, employers have discretion on whether to allow the employee to be accompanied or represented by his or her legal adviser in an investigation meeting or interview. That said, to ensure fairness in the process and to avoid unnecessary allegations of undue influence, the employer may consider allowing the employee to have legal representatives present, especially if serious allegations are made against the employee and the outcome of the investigation could have a significant impact on the employee's future.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

In the case of an employee involved in an internal investigation, a distinction must be made as to whether the employee is acting purely as an informant or whether there are conflicting interests between the company and the employee involved. If the employee is acting purely as an informant, the employee has, in principle, no right to be accompanied by their own legal representative.^[1]

However, if there are conflicting interests between the company and the employee involved, when the employee is accused of any misconduct, the employee must be able to be accompanied by their own legal representative. For example, if the employee's conduct might potentially constitute a criminal offence, the involvement of a legal representative must be permitted.^[2] Failure to allow an accused person to be accompanied by a legal representative during an internal investigation, even though the facts in question are relevant to criminal law, raises the question of the admissibility of statements made in a subsequent criminal proceeding. The principles of the Swiss Criminal Procedure Code cannot be undermined by alternatively collecting evidence in civil proceedings and thus circumventing the stricter rules applicable in criminal proceedings.^[3]

In general, it is advisable to allow the involvement of a legal representative to increase the willingness of the employee involved to cooperate.

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

[2] Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen, in: Jusletter 18 February 2019, N 59.

[3] Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 392; Niklaus Ruckstuhl, BSK-StPO, Art. 158 StPO N 36.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

No, there is no such right.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

L.4990/2022 explicitly states that the exercise of employee rights that refer to consulting from representatives or trade unions and protection against any detrimental measure that results from those consultations does not affect the implementation of any legal provisions. The autonomy of social partners and their right to enter into collective agreements regardless of the level of protection provided by

L.4990/2022[7] is also unaffected.

Under L.4808/2021, legal persons and associations of persons, including trade unions, that have a legitimate interest in doing so may, with the consent of the complainant, bring an action in the complainant's name before the competent administrative or judicial authorities. They may also intervene in their defence[8].

[7] Law 4990/2022 art.5 par.2 (e)

[8] Law 4808/2021 art.14

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Unless the employment contract or the relevant internal policies specify otherwise, there is no automatic right under Hong Kong law for a works council or trade union to be informed or involved in a workplace investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

It is highly recommended that investigation interviews are conducted in the interviewed person's native language, even if the individual speaks the language used for business within the company, to ensure that there is no miscommunication or loss of accuracy in the determination of the facts. Also, speaking their native tongue reduces the discomfort of participating in the interview and potential extra work due to post-interview correction or confirmation. Depending on the scope of the investigation, the company can have

attorneys who speak both the individual's language and the company's business language conducting interviews.

Last updated on 14/09/2023

Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

According to L.4990/2022, any form of retaliation against complainants is prohibited, including threats of retaliation[9]. The complainants have the right to cost-free legal advice about possible acts of retaliation as well as cost-free provision of psychological support (to be defined by Ministerial Decisions)[10]. In terms of other types of support, the complainants are not in principle liable for the acquisition of information or releasing the information they reported under specific conditions (eg, the acquisition or access does not independently constitute a criminal offence, if they had reasonable grounds for believing that a report was necessary to reveal the violation)[11].

L. 4808/2021 states that the dismissal or termination of the legal relationship of employment and any other discrimination that constitutes an act of revenge or retaliation is prohibited and invalid[12].

[9] Law 4990/2022 art.17

[10] Law 4990/2022 art.19

[11] Law 4990/2022 art.18 par.1(a)

[12] Law 4808/2021 art.13

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

It could be stressful for employees to be involved in a workplace investigation, whether as the victim, the subject of an investigation or a witness. More transparency in the process would help reduce stress. This could be achieved by providing the relevant employees with the timeline for different stages of the investigation and regular updates.

The employer may also consider providing mental health support to the employees concerned, for example in the form of counselling services or medical consultations. Where appropriate, the employer may also consider making reasonable adjustments to the employee's workload and work schedule to facilitate his participation in the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

If unrelated matters are revealed as a result of the investigation, the company must be notified and must start a new investigation regarding them per the appropriate rules, without affecting the original investigation.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

If any unrelated matters are revealed as a result of an investigation and are of legal importance, the applicable legal provisions must be implemented and any relevant policies or agreements between the involved parties should be taken into account. For example, if the reporting procedure sheds light on other criminal acts, criminal law procedure may be followed if the matter is reported to the competent authorities.

If these unrelated matters fall under the ambit of another company's policies, the relevant procedures may also be followed separately. However, the employee under investigation must be allowed to defend him or herself, otherwise he or she may raise complaints relating to the procedural guarantees of the investigation.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If unrelated matters are revealed during the investigation, the employer should consider whether an investigation is needed. If yes, the employer should decide whether it is appropriate to incorporate the new matters into the scope of the existing investigation by expanding the terms of reference. However, it may not be appropriate to do so if different individuals are concerned or such inclusion would unduly complicate or delay the progress of the existing investigation. If that is the case, the employer should commence a separate 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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

If the object of the grievance is connected to the ongoing investigation, the investigator may pursue that grievance within the same procedure or open a separate matter, under the company's rules governing such a situation.

If the object of the grievance is not connected to the investigation, the employee must report the matter, or the investigator can do it, if the company's policies allow it.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Employees under investigation frequently raise grievances during investigation procedures that are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The grievances raised by the employee under investigation are examined by

the employees responsible for the investigation. They may either pause the relevant proceedings and review the grievance, especially if the claims of the employee under investigation are linked to a breach of his or her data or hearing rights, or they may continue the investigation.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

As discussed in question 11, an employer owes an implied obligation of trust and confidence towards its employees under common law. This means that an employer cannot disregard a genuine complaint made by an employee even if the employee is under internal investigation. The employer may have put in place an employee grievance handling policy, which should be followed when handling the employee's grievance.

If the grievance raised relates to how the workplace investigation is being conducted (for example, it is alleged that the investigator has a conflict of interest or is biased), the employer should consider suspending the investigation until this grievance is properly addressed to ensure fairness. However, if the grievance is nothing but an attempt to delay or hinder the investigation, the employer may be entitled to proceed with the investigation regardless. The employer should therefore carefully assess the nature and validity of any grievance raised in each case. The employer should also consider its rights under the employment contract if the employee is being uncooperative or obstructive.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

Sick leave suspends the employment agreement, and as a rule the employee should not be contacted during such a suspension. The investigation may continue without the participation of the investigated employee while that employee is absent, have its conclusion suspended while he or she is on leave, and resume once the employee returns to work.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

In principle, the health of an ordinary employee would not prevent the investigation procedure from taking place (eg, interviews with witnesses or the collection of evidence would not be postponed or suspended). However, if the employee under investigation is unwell and they can't participate in the procedure, the investigation may be suspended or postponed until the employee can take part. Bearing in mind the majority of company internal policies and regulations governing workplace investigations provide for a specific framework and timetable for the whole procedure to be completed, the long-term sickness of an employee under investigation may impede the completion of the procedure in the prescribed time. As a result, the person conducting the investigation may seek alternative measures to facilitate participation (eg, teleconferencing).

On a related note, if sickness occurs after the investigation is completed and the employer decides upon the imposition of disciplinary measures against the said employee and the initiation of a relevant procedure, the decision should be duly and timely communicated to the employee, irrespective of whether his or her presence in the workplace is not possible because of the illness.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the employee under investigation goes off sick, the employer should ascertain the medical condition of the employee and when he or she is likely to return to fitness. If the employee is unlikely to return to work for a reasonable time, the employer should consider what adjustments can be made to the investigation process to continue with the investigation. If the employee's input is necessary for the conclusion of the investigation, the employer may invite the employee to provide information by way of a written questionnaire or to attend a virtual meeting. However, the employee may not necessarily agree to these proposals, especially if he or she is unwell. In such circumstances, the employer may not be able to conclude the investigation in the absence of the employee.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

The company may be required to share information or documents with authorities such as a judge, the police, or the Public Attorney's office, or be subject to a government authority's dawn raid. Workplace investigations can and in most cases should continue, and in such circumstances client-work privilege will be essential to enable the employer to control information being shared with third parties.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Incidents of violence and harassment may be dealt with by certain independent authorities, such as the Labour Inspectorate Body and the Greek Ombudsman. The former is competent to impose sanctions on the employer if there is a breach of the general prohibition of violence and harassment at the workplace and the obligation of employers regarding the prevention of such incidents and the obligation to adopt policies within the business. The Greek Ombudsman is competent to deal with disputes when there is violence or harassment in the workplace coupled with discrimination due to, for example, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, or gender identity. Moreover, the applicable legal framework^[13] stipulates that victims of violence and harassment are entitled to lodge a report before the Labour Inspectorate Body and the Greek Ombudsman. This is in addition to the judicial protection he or she may seek and the internal investigation procedure to which he or she may have recourse, without specifying whether internal proceedings may be suspended before the regulatory bodies decide on the matter.

On the other hand, the National Transparency Authority and in certain cases the Hellenic Competition Commission are external reporting channels for employees reporting breaches of Union law. In such cases, L.4990/2022 (article 11 paragraph 5) stipulates that the investigation before the National Transparency Authority is not suspended if reporting procedures before other regulatory authorities have been initiated.

Moreover, criminal investigations can run in parallel with internal probes.



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Where there is a parallel criminal or regulatory investigation, the employer should handle the workplace investigation with extra care and ensure that it complies with all applicable legal requirements or lawful requests made by the relevant authorities concurrently. While there may be reasons why the employer wants to progress with its investigation as soon as possible, the employer should not take any steps that hinder or obstruct the parallel investigations. Therefore, it may be appropriate for the employer to stay its workplace investigation if its continuation may prejudice the parallel investigations.

The employer may also find itself duty-bound to stay the workplace investigation if it is subject to statutory secrecy obligations vis-à-vis the relevant law enforcement agency or regulatory body. As mentioned in question 10, several laws in Hong Kong impose secrecy obligations on any person who has acquired confidential information about certain law enforcement agencies or regulatory bodies and the investigations being conducted. The employer should assess whether they could continue with the workplace investigation without breaching secrecy obligations. The employer should take a prudent approach and may discuss with the relevant authority before proceeding further with its workplace investigation.

Depending on the nature of the matter, authorities in Hong Kong handling a criminal or regulatory investigation may be empowered to seize, or compel persons who are the subject of an investigation or assisting in such an investigation (which may include the employer) to produce, documents or evidence that are relevant to the matters being investigated. For example:

- the police or the Independent Commission Against Corruption may, under a search warrant (or in certain circumstances, without a warrant), inspect and take possession of articles or documents inside the premise of the employer they reasonably suspect to be of value to the investigation of the suspected offence; and
- the SFC or the Competition Commission may, under the SFO or Competition Ordinance (as applicable), require the employee under investigation or the employer to produce documents, attend interviews, and, specifically for the SFC, provide the investigator with all assistance he or she can give. Both authorities may also obtain a warrant from the Hong Kong courts to search the premise of the employer and obtain documents or information it reasonably believes to be relevant to its investigation.

Documents created and evidence gathered by the employer during its workplace investigation (such as witness statements or investigation reports) may be subject to production requests of, or may be seized by, the authorities mentioned above (unless legal professional privilege is attached). The employer should ensure that it complies with all lawful requests from the authorities.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There is no legal obligation to inform them of the outcome. Any obligation would come from the company's policies.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

The employer has an obligation, towards the alleged victim but also the alleged perpetrator, to carefully investigate the report and any existing evidence before making decisions. The employee under investigation must be informed about the outcome of the procedure and any measures adopted in this regard. The respective decision must have due justification.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The employer is generally not obliged under Hong Kong law to inform the employee under investigation of the outcome of the investigation absent any express obligation under the employment contract, even where the investigation has led to a decision to terminate the employee. However, to avoid any unnecessary claim of unlawful dismissal or dismissal without a valid reason, the employer should inform the employee of the reason for his or her termination, even if the investigation results may not be shared in full with the employee.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There is no legal requirement or recommendation for the company to share the full or partial report or findings. It is also not a recommended measure. Therefore, unless the internal rules determine that the company must do it, any answer to queries should be limited to the fact that the investigation was concluded, and the company took the appropriate action.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

There is no explicit legal provision stating the whole report must be communicated with the employee under investigation. The legal framework (L.4990/2022 and L.4808/2021) is governed by strict confidentiality obligations and obligations to protect the complainant's data. From a data protection regulation perspective, it could be argued that the right of the person under investigation to know the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information should be limited to protect the rights of such persons.

However, if the outcome of the investigation leads to the imposition of disciplinary measures, the right of the employee under investigation to request the whole investigation report, to aid in their defence is enhanced. Moreover, if a complaint is made in bad faith or is unfounded, it may be supported that the

employee under investigation is entitled to receive full documentation so he or she can seek adequate legal protection or file an action before the courts.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The employer is generally not obliged to share the investigation report or the findings with the employee under Hong Kong law, absent any express obligations under the employment contract.

However, according to the PDPO, the content of the investigation report or meeting minutes related to the employee (including any findings and opinions expressed in such documents) are likely to constitute the personal data of the employee under investigation. In that case, the employee may have a right under the PDPO to obtain a copy of such documents by making a statutory data access request after the workplace investigation is completed. The employer's obligation to comply with such request is subject to certain exemptions under Part 8 of the PDPO, which include (among others) an exemption on the provision of personal data held for the prevention, preclusion or remedying of unlawful or seriously improper conduct, and the disclosure of which would be likely to prejudice the said purpose or directly or indirectly identify the person who is the source of the data.^[1] Therefore, where there is a parallel criminal proceeding or investigation that has not been concluded, the employer may reject an employee's data access request on the basis that the requested disclosure may prejudice the prevention and remedy of the unlawful conduct. Further, any information protected by legal privilege is also exempt from disclosure under Part 8 of the PDPO.^[2]

If the requested documents also contain the personal data of any other third parties (such as other co-workers of the employee who have also participated in the investigation), the employer should always redact or erase such data before providing the requested documents to the employee under investigation, unless the relevant third parties have consented to the disclosure of the data.

^[1] PDPO sections 20 and 58(1)(d).

^[2] PDPO sections 20 and 60.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

If investigators conclude that a breach has occurred, the company may determine the appropriate response, which may include verbal or written warnings; the suspension of employment without payment (for up to 29 days) or termination of employment without or with cause; a review of policies or operational protocols; and new training modules or the updating of training modules.

If the investigators conclude that a breach has not occurred but determine that the report was made in good faith, the case must be set aside. If the investigators determine that the report was made in bad faith, the employer must determine how to respond to the bad-faith reporter.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

For workplace violence and harassment investigations, depending on the outcome of the internal investigation, the employer may adopt certain measures including, for example, recommendations to the employee under investigation, changes to the employee's working hours and transfer to another department.

If the employer decides to terminate the employment relationship, without having previously followed existing corporate policies regarding reporting procedures or without having provided the alleged perpetrator with the right to be heard, the dismissal could be deemed invalid. In any case, the measures adopted should be appropriate and proportional to the act committed.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the outcome of the investigation reveals that misconduct has been committed by the employee, the employer may consider whether it should allow the employee to defend him or herself against such findings. If the employment contract or relevant internal policies specify a right to be heard on the part of

the employee through a disciplinary hearing before any actions can be taken against him or her, such procedures should be followed.

Assuming the employer maintains its findings that the employee has committed misconduct after the conclusion of the disciplinary hearing (if any), the employer may consider taking one of the following disciplinary actions against the employee depending on the nature and severity of the misconduct:

- Verbal or written warning – this is a common form of disciplinary action. The employer may consider including the nature of the misconduct and the potential consequences of repeating such misconduct (for example, termination of employment) in the warning to be given to the employee;
- Termination with notice – the EO allows employers and employees to terminate the employment with notice. It is not necessary to give reasons for the termination unless the employee concerned has been employed for at least 24 months, in which case the employer shall demonstrate a valid reason for the termination as defined under the EO;
- Suspension – the employer may suspend the employee without pay for up to 14 days in circumstances where the misconduct concerned justifies a summary dismissal, or where a decision on summary dismissal is pending. The employee may also be suspended where there is a criminal proceeding against him or her relevant to the investigation, until the conclusion of the criminal proceeding (as discussed in question 3);[\[1\]](#) and
- Summary dismissal – the employer may terminate an employment contract without notice if the employee is found to have:
 - wilfully disobeyed a lawful and reasonable order;
 - failed to duly and faithfully discharge his duties;
 - committed fraud or acted dishonestly; or
 - been habitually neglectful in his duties.[\[2\]](#)

[\[1\]](#) EO section 11(1).

[\[2\]](#) EO section 9. The employer is also entitled to summarily dismiss an employee on any other ground on which he would be entitled to terminate the contract without notice at common law.

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.

[\[1\]](#) David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 180 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

There are no legal requirements for the company to share the investigation findings with any party, including the reporter and the investigated party, so the employer must carefully consider the pros and cons of doing so on a case-by-case basis. Interview records can generally be kept private if interviews were conducted by an attorney.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

In principle, there is no specific obligation for investigating persons to disclose their findings. For proceedings before a court that have been initiated or investigated by the police or competent regulatory bodies, the relevant findings may be communicated under strict conditions and provided that the personal data of the parties involved are not publicly disclosed.

More specifically, under L. 4490/2022, in the context of whistleblowing procedures, personal data and any information that leads, directly or indirectly, to the identification of the complainant are not disclosed to anyone other than employees involved in the investigation, unless the complainant consents. The identity of the complainant and any other information may only be disclosed in the context of investigations by competent authorities or judicial proceedings, to the extent necessary for the protection of the employee under investigation's rights of defence. Confidentiality obligations govern the procedure for revealing trade secrets to police and regulatory bodies, especially in the framework of L.4990/2022.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

As mentioned in questions 21, 22 and 23, under Hong Kong law, the employer is generally not obliged to actively disclose the findings of a workplace investigation to any party.

Having said that, the employer should be aware of certain statutory disclosure requirements that may become applicable as a result of the matters revealed during the workplace investigation. For example, if the investigation reveals or gives rise to any knowledge or suspicion that any property represents the proceeds of an indictable offence^[1], drug trafficking^[2], or terrorism^[3], the employer is required to report its knowledge or suspicion, together with any matter on which that knowledge or suspicion is based, to the JFIU as soon as is reasonably practicable (even where the investigation has not yet been concluded). Employers who are licensed corporations must also provide the SFC with information about whether

departing licensed employees were the subject of an internal investigation in the six months prior to his/her departure. If the internal investigation commences after the departure of the licensed employee, the licensed corporation should notify the SFC as soon as practicable^[4].

In any event, as in question 14, if any documents related to the investigation are protected by legal professional privilege, they can generally be kept confidential and would not be subject to disclosure even if the employer is subject to a mandatory reporting or disclosure obligation.

^[1] OSCO section 25A(1).

^[2] DTROPO section 25A(1).

^[3] UNATMO section 12(1).

^[4] Frequently Asked Questions on “Disclosure of investigations commenced by licensed corporations in the notifications of cessation of accreditation” issued by the SFC on 21 May 2019

<<https://www.sfc.hk/en/faqs/intermediaries/licensing/Disclosure-of-investigations-commenced-by-licensed-corporations#627D0257CCA8410189F48C1A68443112>>.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Switzerland

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

The employer is generally not required to disclose the final report, or the data obtained in connection with the investigation. In particular, the employer is not obliged to file a criminal complaint with the police or the public prosecutor's office.

Exceptions may arise, for example, from data protection law (see question 22) or a duty to release records may arise in a subsequent state proceeding.

Data voluntarily submitted in a proceeding in connection with the internal investigation shall be considered private opinion or party assertion.^[1] If the company refuses to hand over the documents upon request, coercive measures may be used under certain circumstances.^[2]

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

The existence of the investigation should be kept on file for at least five years from the date of its conclusion. All information related to the investigation should be kept on file for the same period, but not on the employee's record, to avoid the risk of accidental access by unauthorised individuals.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

Under the General Data Protection Regulation, employees' personal details and information must be kept in the business records for as long as is necessary for the purposes of the employment relationship. Otherwise, stored data must be deleted. However, under L.4990/2022^[14], reports remain in the relevant record for a reasonable and necessary time, and in any case until the completion of investigations or proceedings before the courts that have been initiated as a consequence of a complaint against the employee under investigation, the complainant or any third parties.

^[14] L.4990/2022 art.16 par.1

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

There is no legal requirement in Hong Kong on this. However, since the investigation records will likely contain personal data, employers should be mindful of the requirement under the PDPO that personal data should not be kept for longer than necessary.^[1]

According to the Code of Practice on Human Resources Management published by the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, generally, employment data about an employee can be kept for the entire duration of his or her employment, plus a recommended period of no more than seven years after the employee leaves employment unless there is a subsisting reason that justifies a longer retention period. A longer retention period may be justified where there is ongoing litigation or a parallel investigation. Even where it is deemed necessary to retain the outcome of the investigation concerning a departed employee, the employer should ensure that other personal data on the employee's record (that is unrelated to the purpose of retention) are erased after the expiry of the recommended retention period.

^[1] DPP2 (in Sch. 1) and PDPO section 26.

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?



Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*
at CGM

The employer's legal exposure resulting from errors during the investigation depends on the error and the victim or victims affected. It may range from paying damages to a witness who was harassed because the company did not prevent retaliation from occurring; to the reversal of a termination for cause if a court determines that the evidence collected during the investigation did not meet the legal threshold to uphold it; to indemnification for a violation of privacy; or criminal prosecution because of unauthorised access to private communications.

Last updated on 14/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*
at Karatzas & Partners

The employee can contest the decisions of disciplinary councils before the courts and request their annulment.

Moreover, in the framework of L.4990/2022, a monetary penalty and prison sentence (to be defined by an implementing Ministerial Decision) may be imposed on any person violating confidentiality obligations concerning the identity and personal data of employees or third parties included in the investigation procedure, while monetary penalties are also provided for legal entities^[15].

Moreover, administrative fines may also be imposed if the employer does not comply with the legal

requirements concerning the prevention of violence and harassment in the workplace.

Furthermore, the employee under investigation may initiate proceedings before the courts under tort law, by claiming compensation for moral damages suffered if the company did not comply with its confidentiality obligations after the incident (eg, due to the spread of rumours in the workplace). This may also be linked with criminal law proceedings against the persons responsible for dealing with the investigation (and not against the legal person, since under Greek law there is no criminal liability for legal persons).

On the other hand, the employer may also be exposed to liability vis-à-vis the complainant, witnesses or facilitators, for breach of confidentiality or other obligations prescribed in the respective legal provisions, or if there are retaliation measures.

[15] L.4990/2022 art.23 par.1

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the employer failed to comply with a requirement that is expressly stipulated in the employment contract or employee handbook (such as a procedural requirement to hold a disciplinary hearing or to provide certain information to the employee), the employer could be liable for breaching an express term in the employment contract.

Even where the employment contract does not contain express provisions for the conduct of an internal investigation, the employer is under an implied obligation of trust and confidence under common law (as discussed in question 11), which requires it to conduct the investigation and reach its findings reasonably and rationally in accordance with the evidence available and in good faith.[1] If the employer reached a decision that no reasonable employer would have reached, the conduct of the investigation may be in breach of the employer's implied obligation of trust and confidence.

If the error in the investigation has led to a termination of employment (whether by way of summary dismissal or termination by notice), the employee may be able to bring a statutory claim for wrongful dismissal, unlawful dismissal or dismissal without a valid reason (as applicable).[2] If such a claim is successful, in addition to ordering the employer to pay monetary compensation, the court or tribunal may also make a reinstatement order (an order that the employee shall be treated as if he had not been dismissed) or re-engagement order (an order that the employee shall be re-engaged in employment on terms comparable to his or her original terms of employment) for the affected employee.

The employer may also be liable for unlawful discrimination under Hong Kong law if the investigation has been conducted in a discriminatory manner or the outcome of the investigation reflects differential and less favourable treatment of the employee concerned based on grounds of sex, marital status, disability, family status or race.

[1] *Chok Kin Ming v Equal Opportunities Commission* [2019] HKCFI 755

[2] EO sections 9 and 32K.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Brazil

Patricia Barboza
Maury Lobo
CGM



Greece

Angeliki Tsatsi
Anna Pechlivanidi
Pinelopi Anyfanti
Katerina Basta
Karatzas & Partners



Hong Kong

Wynne Mok
Jason Cheng
Audrey Li
Slaughter and May



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer