

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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

- The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (as amended)
- The Criminal Code Act
- Penal Code Law
- Money Laundering (Prohibition) Act 2011 (as amended)
- Freedom of Information Act 2011
- Terrorism (Prevention) Act 2013
- Independent Corrupt Practices and other related offences Act 2000
- Code of Conduct Bureau and Tribunal Act

- Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020
- Nigerian Code of Corporate Governance 2018
- Economic Financial Crime Commission (Establishment) Act 2004
- Investment Securities Act 2007
- Central Bank of Nigeria Act 2007
- Banks and Other Financial Institutions Act 2020
- Whistleblowing Programme under the Ministry of Finance

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

A workplace investigation is usually governed by the employer's internal grievance policy or contractual guidelines found in the employment contract or employee handbook. In the absence of the same, the default governing regime is as set out by the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) and the Tripartite Alliance for Fair and Progressive Employment Practices (TAFEP) in its guidelines and advisories, which include:

- the Tripartite Advisory on Managing Workplace Harassment;
- the TAFEP Grievance Handling Handbook; and
- the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices.

In addition, section 14(1) of the Employment Act 1968 provides that an employer is required to conduct "due inquiry" before dismissing an employee covered under the Employment Act 1968 without notice for misconduct. The Singapore Courts take the view that "due inquiry" suggests some sort of process in which the employee concerned is informed about the allegations and the evidence against him or her so that he or she has an opportunity to defend him or herself with or without evidence during the investigation process.

Further, there are numerous cases where the Singapore High Court has alluded to or implicitly accepted the application of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence in employment contracts that would oblige the employer to act reasonably and fairly during the investigation, even though it is worth noting that the Singapore Court of Appeal has stated that the status of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence has not been settled in Singapore and that the Appellate Division of the Singapore High Court has stated that "[i]t remains an open question for the Court of Appeal to resolve in a more appropriate case, ideally with facts capable of bearing out a claim based directly on the existence of the implied term" (see [81]-[82] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd* and another [2022] SGHC(A) 8).

Hence, any references to the application of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence in Singapore in this article must be read in light of the above.

The current position is expected to change in the second half of 2024, with the passing of Singapore's first workplace fairness law, the Workplace Fairness Legislation. On 4 August 2023, the Singapore government announced that it has accepted the final set of recommendations by the Tripartite Committee on Workplace Fairness in respect of the upcoming Workplace Fairness Legislation. The Tripartite Committee on Workplace Fairness recommended, among other things, that employers are required to put grievance-handling processes in place. It is therefore expected that the Workplace Fairness Legislation may contain requirements on how and when a workplace investigation should be conducted.

This article sets out the current position, before the Workplace Fairness Legislation was enacted, and will be updated when appropriate.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

A workplace investigation is conducted to verify alleged misconduct within a workplace.^[1] Once a complaint is made regarding wrongdoing, misconduct or unethical behaviour by an employee or group of employees within a workplace, an investigation is required to confirm the complaint and if it is confirmed, the body in charge of supervising the employees (usually the HR specialist, disciplinary committee or line managers) determine and implement necessary corrective or disciplinary actions.

[1] [Conducting Internal Investigations In Organisation - Health & Safety - Nigeria \(mondag.com\)](https://mondag.com/Conducting-Internal-Investigations-In-Organisation-Health-Safety-Nigeria)



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

A workplace investigation usually commences with the receipt of feedback, a complaint or a grievance, by named or anonymous persons, in respect of a work-related matter or event, or the conduct of an employee.

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)?



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Yes, an employee can be suspended during an investigation to allow the employer to investigate the allegations against the employee unhindered and without undue interference by that employee. A suspension under the law merely prevents the employee from discharging the ordinary functions of his or her role without any deprivation of his rights during the period of the suspension. Thus, unless there is an express provision in the contract of employment or employee's handbook stating that the employee can be suspended with or without half pay, the employee would be entitled to a full salary.

Further, the duration for which the employee may be suspended should be as contained in the employee's contract, employee's handbook, or letter of suspension.

In the recent case of *GLOBE MOTORS HOLDINGS NIGERIA LIMITED v. AKINYEMI ADEGOKE OYEWOLE (2022)*, the court held, *"Since suspension is not a termination of the employment contract nor a dismissal of the employee, the implication is that the employee is still in continuous employment of the employer until he is recalled or formally terminated or dismissed. Pending his recall or dismissal, a suspended employee is entitled to his wages or salary during the period of suspension, unless the terms of the contract of employment or the letter of suspension itself is specific that the suspended employer will not be paid salaries during the period of suspension"*.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Yes. Section 14(1) read with 14(8) of the Employment Act 1968 provides that an employee can be suspended during a workplace investigation

However, pursuant to section 14(8) of the Employment Act 1968, the employer:

- may suspend the employee from work for:
 - a period not exceeding one week; or
 - such longer period as the Commissioner for Labour may determine on an application by the employer; but
- must pay the employee at least half the employee's salary during the period the employee is suspended from work.

Section 14(9) of the Employment Act 1968 further states that if the inquiry does not disclose any misconduct on the employee's part, the employer must immediately restore to the employee the full amount of the withheld salary.

In addition to the above legislative requirements, the company is required to also comply with its policies relating to such suspensions.

In terms of the threshold to be crossed before a suspension can take place, the Singapore Courts have highlighted that suspending an employee quickly as part of a “knee-jerk” reaction to an unclear or unspecific allegation with dubious credibility is arguably a breach of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence that exists in all employment relationships ([56] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd and another* [2021] SGHC 123). The employer would need to have proper and reasonable cause to suspend an employee for disciplinary purposes ([56(d)] of *Cheah Peng Hock v Luzhou Bio-Chem Technology Ltd* [2013] 2 SLR 577; [2013] SGHC 32), for example, where multiple credible sources claimed that they had been sexually harassed by an employee, and the employer had strong grounds to believe that if the employee was not suspended, the safety and wellbeing of the other employees in the organisation would be threatened.

In contrast, an employer is not entitled to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation where the employer has only received one complaint that has not been properly described or substantiated with sufficient details from an unverified or unreliable source against an employee who has a good track record with the organisation. This is especially so if the complaint is so unclear that further inquiries should be made before the allegation can be properly ascertained and characterised (see also [51] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd and another* [2021] SGHC 123).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Typically, the legal department, the chief compliance officer, the HR manager, the audit committee or any other committee as may be set up by the company may conduct a workplace investigation. However, in other instances, the company may engage the services of independent external personnel to assist with conducting an internal investigation.

The minimum qualification or criteria of the person conducting the investigation should be as contained in the relevant company policies. Criteria may include independence, objectivity and impartiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

While there are no prescribed minimum qualifications or criteria that need to be met for any person conducting a workplace investigation, the person handling employee grievances should be someone who:

- has been authorised and empowered to do so by the employer;
- is not in a position of actual or potential conflict; and
- is independent and impartial.

The grievance handler should be familiar with the organisation's investigative procedure, have attended the relevant training to ensure full compliance with the same; and have a good understanding of the expectations and norms set out by the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices.

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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Generally, issues surrounding workplace investigations are usually embedded in either the employee's contract or handbook, which is binding on the employee. Thus, an employee cannot validly bring an action to stop the investigation unless his rights as guaranteed by the Constitution, the Employee's handbook, and other laws such as a right to a fair hearing are violated during the investigation.

Consequently, the employee may apply to the National Industrial Court for an order of interim relief against his or her employer restraining further prejudicial investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employee under investigation is entitled to apply to the Court to stop the investigation. However, the employee bears the legal burden of showing that the employer has, for instance:

1. failed to comply with the organisation's grievance policy;
2. committed a serious breach of natural justice; and/or
3. breached the implied term of mutual trust and confidence when investigating the matter, and that such a breach will, unless remedied, cause such prejudice to the employee that it would be more just for the investigation to be stopped than to be allowed to continue.

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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The employee's contract, employee handbook or company policies typically mandate an employee to cooperate and participate in good faith in any lawful internal investigation undertaken by the company, and also protects an employee acting as a witness in an internal investigation. Some of the legal protections available to an employee acting as a witness during workplace investigations are freedom from intimidation, threats or the loss of employment.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Singapore law does not impose any statutory or legal obligation on an employee to act as a witness in the investigation. Accordingly, an employer does not have the power to compel its employees to act as

witnesses in an investigation.

Notwithstanding this, an employer may require an employee to assist in investigations pursuant to specific contractual obligations in the employee's terms of employment (as may be contained in the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations, etc). Further, a request for an employee to provide evidence of an event that he or she knows of may reasonably be deemed to be a lawful and reasonable directive from an employer.

Consequently, an employee's refusal to act as a witness may amount to an act of insubordination that may attract disciplinary action by the employer.

Employers requiring employees to act as witnesses in an investigation must ensure that they comply with the expectations and norms set out by the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices and the TAFEP Grievance Handling Handbook.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on hrtoday.ch, last visited on 17 June 2022.

^[2] Same opinion: Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on hrtoday.ch, last visited on 17 June 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

When gathering evidence, the person being investigated is protected by the Constitution, the Freedom of Information Act and the Nigerian Data Protection Regulation (NDPR), among others.

The Constitution, particularly section 37, guarantees the right of a person to privacy.

The NDPR is the main data protection regulation in Nigeria. It regulates the processing and transfer of personal data.

Further, the Freedom of Information Act, 2011 prohibits the disclosure of information gathered during an investigation to the public.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employer may collect the personal data of an individual without the individual's consent or from a source other than the individual, where it is necessary for any investigation according to section 17(1) read with paragraph 4 of Part 3 of the Third Schedule of the Personal Data Protection Act 2012 (PDPA). Under section 2(1) of the PDPA, "investigation" means an investigation relating to:

- a breach of an agreement;
- a contravention of any written law, or any rule of professional conduct or other requirement imposed by any regulatory authority in the exercise of its powers under any written law; or
- a circumstance or conduct that may result in a remedy or relief being available under any law.

Under the Banking Act 1970, a bank and its officers cannot disclose customer information to third parties, subject to certain exceptions. An employer carrying out a workplace investigation does not fall within any of the exceptions.

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?



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Yes, an employer can search the possessions or files of an employee as part of an investigation where the employee's contract or handbook authorises such a search and there is a reasonable suspicion of wrongdoing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employer is not allowed to search employees' personal possessions or files as part of an investigation without the employee's consent. However, such consent may be explicitly provided for in the terms of employment (as may be contained in the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations, etc). The employer may, however, search the employees' company email accounts and files if these are stored on the company's internal systems or devices.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Consideration must be given to the confidentiality or anonymity of the whistleblower, when an investigation involves whistleblowing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Under the Prevention of Corruption Act 1960 and the Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes (Confiscation of Benefits) Act 1992 (CDSCA), in any civil or criminal proceeding, no witness is obliged to disclose the name or address of any informer, or disclose any information that might lead to his or her discovery concerning offences such as corruption, drug trafficking, and money laundering, save where:

- in any proceeding for the offence, the Court, after a full inquiry into the case, is of the opinion that the informer wilfully made, in his complaint, a material statement that he knew or believed to be false or did not believe to be true; or
- in any other proceeding, the court is of the opinion that justice cannot be fully done between the parties without the discovery of the informer.

In line with the above, employers should therefore keep the informer's identity confidential upon receiving a complaint relating to corruption, drug trafficking, money laundering, and other serious offences prescribed in the second schedule of the CDSCA.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Workplace investigations should be kept strictly confidential to protect the parties involved in the investigation from victimisation. Some of the confidential obligations that apply during investigations are the identities of the parties involved in the process (whether as a complainant, respondent or witnesses), the confidentiality of reports, recordings and other documents generated or discovered during the investigation, as well as attorney-client privilege between the employee and his or her attorney, provided that such privilege is within the bounds of the law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The existence and scope of any confidentiality obligations would generally depend on the specific terms of the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations.

In the context of investigations into workplace harassment issues, the Tripartite Advisory on Managing Workplace Harassment issued by the MOM provides that the identities of the alleged harasser, affected persons and the informant should be protected unless the employer assesses that disclosure is necessary for safety reasons.

This may change with the enactment of the Workplace Fairness Legislation referred to in question 1. The Tripartite Committee on Workplace Fairness recommended, among other things, that employers should protect the confidentiality of the identity of persons who report workplace discrimination and harassment, where possible. As such, it is expected that the upcoming Workplace Fairness Legislation may impose certain confidentiality obligations on an employer during an investigation.

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.

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

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

An employee must be given the full details of the allegations against him or her to enable the employee to make adequate representations against the complaints made against him or her.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

There is no specific list of information about the allegations against the employee under investigation that must be provided to the employee under investigation. However, the information provided to the employee must be sufficiently clear and specific so that the employee understands the case being made against him or her and can respond to it. The employee should also be made aware of the evidence against him or her and be given a reasonable opportunity to respond.

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?



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Typically, the identities of the complainant, witnesses and sources of information for the investigation are kept confidential.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Such information can be kept confidential, subject to questions 10 and 11. However, disclosure may nevertheless be compelled in court or arbitration proceedings as well as by disclosure requests or directions by the police or statutory authorities, including the MOM.

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?



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

NDAs are usually part of an employee's contract and, as such, create a contractual obligation between the parties privy to it. However, where the subject matter of an investigation borders on matters of a criminal nature, it might be impossible for parties to the NDA to continually uphold the obligation under the NDA because the parties have an obligation to the state to disclose facts of a criminal nature.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Yes, NDAs can be used to keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential. There are no express prohibitions against such NDAs under Singapore law. However, information or evidence covered by the NDA may still be discoverable in court or arbitration proceedings; and may also be subject to disclosure requests or directions by the police or statutory authorities, including the MOM.

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?



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Privilege attaches to investigation materials when a legal practitioner facilitates the internal investigation. Documents prepared during a workplace investigation will not automatically attract legal professional privilege, unless the investigation is facilitated by a legal practitioner.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Litigation privilege may attach to investigation materials if there was a reasonable prospect of litigation at the time of the creation of the materials, and the materials were created for the dominant purpose of a pending or contemplated litigation.

Legal advice privilege may attach to investigation materials if the materials were created to seek or obtain legal advice; or if the materials contain legal advice that is so embedded or has become such an integral part of the materials that the legal advice cannot be redacted from them. If the legal advice is separable

from the materials, then only the parts of the materials containing legal advice will be protected by privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The Constitution guarantees the right of every person to legal representation during investigations and interrogations by law enforcement agencies. However, our labour legislation is silent on whether an employee has a right to be accompanied or have legal representation during an investigation. Whether an employee has a right to legal representation will depend on the policy of the employer as well as the nature of the interrogation.

In practice, an employee is usually not accompanied or represented legally during an investigation. However, unless it is stipulated in the employee's policy, nothing prohibits the employee from being accompanied or represented legally during an investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

This is dependent on the employee's employment contract and the employer's internal grievance policies and investigative processes. There is no free-standing legal entitlement for an employee to have legal representation. Employers may, at their discretion, consider allowing an employee to bring a colleague or to have legal representation if such a request is reasonable, such as to provide emotional support to the employee who may view the disciplinary hearing as an unnerving and stressful experience or so that the employee may be advised and informed of his or her legal rights in respect of the investigation commenced against him or her.

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?



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The law is silent on whether a member of a trade union has the right to be informed or involved in the investigation. Typically, this is dependent on the employee's contract, handbook or other policies of the employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

An employee who is a member of a works council or trade union has the right to seek assistance from the works council or trade union representative (whichever is applicable) and have the works council or trade union involved in resolving the grievances.

For unionised companies, the grievance procedure and the role of the union representative are usually set out in the collective agreement entered into between the company and the works council or trade union. In some organisations, the employee handbook or grievance policy will also state when the trade union representative will be involved in the investigation process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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)

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

An employee being investigated has a right to be heard before a decision being made by the employer. Further, the body responsible for investigating the employee must be independent, so as not to be considered biased.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Employers may provide support, such as:

1. offering counselling for its employees to encourage open discussions and communication on any issues that they may be facing or clarify any questions they may have in respect of the investigation process;
2. reminding its employees of its zero-retaliation policy; and, if need be
3. making the necessary work arrangement to minimise potential interaction that would further aggravate the conflict or situation between the employees involved.

Employers may also inform employees of the external resources available to them if they require any assistance in respect of the investigation provided by external parties such as TAFEP, the Singapore National Employers Federation, National Trade Union Congress, and Legal Aid Bureau.

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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Where unrelated matters are revealed as a result of the investigation, the body investigating the employee is expected to inform the employee of the new matters and give him adequate time to respond.

However, there are exceptional cases where a crime is revealed during an investigation. In such instances, the employer is required to report its findings to the police for investigation and possible prosecution.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

If unrelated matters that require further investigation are revealed as a result of the investigation, the employer should take the necessary steps to investigate these matters, where relevant, under the employer's grievance reporting, investigation and disciplinary processes. This should be done separately and independently from the existing investigation. Please note that section 424 of the Criminal Procedure Code imposes a legal duty on any person who is aware that another has committed certain specified offences to "immediately" report the matter to the police, "in the absence of reasonable excuse" not to do so. Failure to comply with this requirement is punishable with imprisonment for up to six months, and/or a

fine.

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?



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

It is not unusual for an employee under investigation to raise a grievance during the investigation. This grievance may be on the same subject matter as the complaint being investigated or may disclose new facts outside the scope of the matter being investigated.

Where the issue discloses new facts, the employer is required to investigate those facts without suspending the investigation. However, where the grievance relates to the same subject matter as the complaint being investigated, the employer may either suspend the investigation to allow the investigation to recognise the grievance and the complaint against the employer or proceed with the investigation while noting that the matter disclosed is being or will be investigated.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employer should require the employee to raise the grievance under the company's existing grievance reporting, disciplinary and investigation processes so that the grievance, to the extent that it is relevant to the current investigation, can be investigated together. Otherwise, the grievance can be dealt with separately and independently of the existing investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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.

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The investigation would be suspended until the employee returns from sick leave. The investigation will immediately restart upon the return of the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

If the employee under investigation has already responded to the allegations made against him or her and his or her participation is no longer required at this stage in the investigation, the employer may proceed with the investigation even while the employee is off sick.

However, if the employee under investigation has not responded to the allegations made against him or her and his or her participation is still required in the investigation, the company may exercise its discretion to pause the investigation until the employee can assist in the investigations. To prevent an employee from using a medical condition as an excuse to delay or avoid the investigation, the company may require the employee to provide specific medical documentation to address the issue of the employee's ability to participate in the investigation and to adjust the investigation process accordingly. For instance, instead of scheduling an in-person interview, the company may send a list of written questions for the employee to answer, and may also extend timelines for responding, etc.

If the employee is unable to return to work for the foreseeable future, the employer may consider reaching a provisional outcome based on the available evidence, which would be subject to change when the employee under investigation can return to work.

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).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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.

^[13] Law 4808/2018 art.10

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Where an employee has committed misconduct at work that is also the subject of a police investigation, the employer can conduct its own investigation and does not have to await the outcome of the criminal proceedings. The Supreme Court, in the case of *Dongtoe v CSC Plateau State* (2001), held that it is preposterous to suggest that the administrative body should stay its disciplinary jurisdiction over a person who had admitted criminal offences.

Further, the police or regulator may compel the employer to share evidence with it in the interests of justice.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Generally, there are no issues with an internal investigation being conducted in parallel to a criminal or regulatory investigation. The employer should inform the authorities of the ongoing internal investigation and comply with lawful directions from the authorities, for example, to share evidence gathered during the investigation with the authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The employee under investigation must be informed of the outcome of the investigation as soon as a decision is reached.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employee under investigation should be told of the findings that have been made against the employee, the disciplinary action (if any) that will be taken against the employee and any avenue or timeline for the employee to appeal the outcome of the investigation.

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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The employer needs to balance the interests of the employee investigated, and the interests of other persons involved in the investigation such as the complainant and witnesses. Thus, the employer may either share the findings of the investigation or the full investigation report, provided that the identities of all other persons involved in the investigation are kept confidential.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

It would suffice for a summary of the investigation's findings to be shared with the complainant and the respondent employees.

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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Upon the completion and receipt of the findings of the investigation, the employer may affirm the employee's innocence or take disciplinary action against them.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employer should take any follow-up steps required and keep track of whether any appeal against the outcome of the investigation is lodged. If any appeal is lodged, the employer should handle this appeal following its internal procedure. To the extent necessary, any disciplinary measures against the respondent employee should be stayed pending the outcome of the appeal.

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?

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

Investigation findings may be disclosed to the employee and every other person having an interest in the investigation. Where it is discovered that a crime has been committed, the investigation findings may be disclosed to the regulators or police.

Typically, interview records are kept private and will not be disclosed unless it is interest of justice.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

A summary of the investigation's findings should be disclosed to the employee who lodged the grievance and the employee under investigation.

If there are parallel criminal or regulatory investigations, the investigation findings should also be disclosed to the authorities.

Interview records or transcripts should be kept private unless disclosure is required by a court order or at the direction of the authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

The law does not provide for the time the outcome of the investigation may remain on the employee's record. However, this will depend on the employer's record-retention policies, which must comply with applicable data protection laws.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

This depends on the company's internal disciplinary policy and the severity of the offence. For instance, a written warning issued against an employee for minor misconduct is usually kept in the respondent employee's file for one year and if the employee does not commit any further breaches during this time, the written warning will be expunged. However, if there is a finding of serious misconduct, particularly if such a determination results in the dismissal of the employee, these records are generally kept in the employee's file for the duration of time such records are statutorily required to be maintained.

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,

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



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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

- Violation of Fundamental Rights of the Employee
- Breach of Contract of Employment or wrongful termination

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

The employer may be exposed to legal action for a failure to properly conduct the investigation, including having such portions of the investigation set aside or held to be void by the courts, and be made to pay damages to the affected employee; or face investigation and administrative penalties by regulatory authorities such as the MOM.

In addition, after the Workplace Fairness Legislation comes into force, breach of its requirements may also expose the employer or culpable persons to potential statutory penalties. The Tripartite Committee on Workplace Fairness recommended, among other things, for the Workplace Fairness Legislation to provide for a range of penalties including corrective orders, work pass curtailment and financial penalties against employers or culpable persons, depending on the severity of the breach. It is thus expected that employers or culpable persons may be exposed to potential statutory penalties if the requirements of the Workplace Fairness Legislation are not complied with.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Greece

Angeliki Tsatsi
Anna Pechlivanidi
Pinelopi Anyfanti
Katerina Basta
Karatzas & Partners



Nigeria

Adekunle Obebe
Bloomfield LP



Singapore

Jonathan Yuen
Doreen Chia
Tan Ting Ting
Rajah & Tann Singapore



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer