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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Greece

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

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

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

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

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

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?

Greece

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

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

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

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

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

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

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)

[12] Law 4808/2021 art.13

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Contributors

Greece

Angeliki Tsatsi
Anna Pechlivanidi
Pinelopi Anyfanti
Katerina Basta
Karatzas & Partners

Singapore

Jonathan Yuen
Doreen Chia
Tan Ting Ting
Rajah & Tann Singapore