

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?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Austrian law does not impose an obligation on employers to conduct internal investigations and they do not have to follow a specific legal pattern when doing so. However, an obligation to conduct internal investigations may arise out of certain provisions of criminal, company or even labour law – in particular, an indirect obligation arising from an employer's duty of care, which requires them to act against employee mistreatment, such as bullying.

If such internal investigations are initiated, compliance with labour law and data protection regulations is mandatory. According to section 16 of the Austrian Civil Code (ABGB), the employer must also protect the personal rights of the individual. It is important to emphasise that a company's internal investigation is a private measure and differs from official investigations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

In Greece, workplace investigations are not heavily regulated.

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

There is no specific legislation governing workplace investigations in Turkish law. However, there are general principles stemming from Labour Law No. 4857 as well as good practice principles. Data protection laws also occasionally intertwine with these. The internal codes and policies of the company should also be followed throughout the process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, an internal investigation is only initiated if there is suspicion of a violation. The decision to commence an internal investigation is up to the company, and it has to weigh the pros and cons. For limited liability companies, which are subject to the Association Responsibility Act, an internal investigation may exempt them from criminal liability. Disadvantages may include investigation costs, disruption of operations, discovery of information requiring later disclosure, possible negative media coverage and increased risk of exposure to external parties.

Investigations can relate to specific individuals, departments, or the entire company. An investigation may include various measures, such as obtaining and analysing files and documents, conducting questionnaires and employee interviews, monitoring internet use, video or telephone surveillance of employees and setting up whistleblowing hotlines. Not all measures are acceptable without restrictions. The provisions of labour law and data protection law must always be complied with.

To avoid wasting resources, the objectives of the investigation should be defined in advance. In addition, the selection and sequence of instruments to be used should be determined. A legal assessment of the chosen measures is essential to avoid legal complications.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The need to initiate an internal investigation may arise from the receipt of information from various sources. Reporting is one of the most common sources and can be in different forms. In Turkey, while conventional methods such as reporting to a direct supervisor, human resources or executives is quite common, whistleblowers also use reporting mechanisms such as web-based forms, telephone hotlines or e-mail, if such mechanisms exist. It is critical to obtain as much information as possible from the complainants at this initial contact, to make a sound decision on whether or not to commence an investigation. There is no requirement to decide to start an investigation and it can be commenced through a corporate resolution (eg, ethics committee resolution or board resolution) of a decision-making body or a decision of the body or person who has such authority under the company policies. The investigation team who will conduct the process may also be approved by the company's decision-making body. It is also advisable to have a preliminary inquiry for the complaints, before commencing a fully-fledged investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Yes. An employer may always, and without legal restrictions, temporarily suspend an employee during an internal investigation, provided he or she continues to be paid.

However, suspending the employee does not release the employer from an obligation to terminate employment without notice. It must be clear to the employee that the suspension is a temporary measure in preparation for dismissal. A suspension does not entitle the employer to postpone the reasons for dismissal for any length of time. The longer the suspension lasts, the more likely it is that the employer intends to keep the employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

An employee can be suspended during a workplace investigation provided his or her prior written consent is obtained to this effect during or immediately before the investigation. Obtaining a generic written consent from the employee regarding suspension, which is not tied to a specific event, will not be valid. If there is a suspension of employment due to the workplace investigation, the obligations of the parties arising from the employment relationship continue, except for the employer's obligation to pay a salary (and provide benefits, if any) and the employees' duty to perform work.

There is no provision or established court decision setting forth the rules regarding the length of the suspension period; however, as a general rule, this period should be as brief as possible, so as not to cause any impression that the employment relationship has been terminated by the employer. Suspension of an employee on full pay during a workplace investigation, which is also known as garden leave, is a commonly used alternative to a conventional suspension method described above. During the garden leave period, an employee can be banned from entering the workplace and performing any of his or her duties either partially or entirely while continuing to be paid his or her regular salary, along with fringe benefits. Garden leave is not a concept regulated under Turkish employment legislation, but rather developed in practice, mostly by the Turkish subsidiaries of multinational companies. An ideal approach for the implementation of garden leave would be to obtain the written consent of the employees either at the commencement of employment or during the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

There are no prescribed minimum standards for this procedure. The responsibility for conducting these investigations lies with the employers. Internal compliance or legal teams are often entrusted with this task, as they are familiar with internal protocols. In practice, these investigations are often overseen by an internal team, occasionally with the assistance of law firms or auditing firms. Those involved in the investigation must remain impartial. Potentially biased persons, such as those under investigation and their close associates, should be excluded from participation.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Switzerland

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

The examinations can be carried out internally by designated internal employees, by external specialists, or by a combination thereof. The addition of external advisors is particularly recommended if the allegations are against an employee of a high hierarchical level^[1], if the allegations concerned are quite substantive and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

^[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 18.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*

at Paksoy

There is no compulsory requirement or qualification arising from the law as to the selection of the investigation team. The number and the profile of the investigation team need to be decided according to the characteristics of the case, whereas the head of the investigation team needs to be a competent and experienced investigator. A conflict of interest review is required to be conducted for the whole investigation team to protect the interests of the company. As conflicts of interest can also arise during an investigation process, relying on the support of an outside legal team should be considered, particularly for internal investigations that are likely to expand.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If the investigated employee believes that individual measures violate his rights, he or she can defend him or herself against them, but he or she cannot stop the entire investigation.

In principle, the employee has various rights such as access, rectification, erasure and the right to contest the processing of his or her data (articles 12-17 and 21 GDPR). Should these principles be violated, the employee has the right to lodge a complaint with the data protection authority.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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.

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

There is no specific remedy provided under Turkish law to stop the investigation. One may consider requesting an injunction from a court for this purpose, but it is less likely that such a request would be successful. This is because investigations are often conducted for fact-finding purposes and to obtain an injunction the claimant will need to prove that this fact-finding exercise will pose a great risk and cause irreparable harm to the employee.

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?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

An essential part of an internal investigation is the questioning of employees. Their statements contribute significantly to clarifying possible violations. In particular, the legal principles that apply to criminal proceedings, including the right to refuse to testify, do not apply directly to internal investigations.

Employees do not legally have to participate in such interviews. Their duty to cooperate arises indirectly from other legal provisions, in particular from employees' duties of loyalty and service under labour law.

Austrian law suggests there is a general principle of loyalty, which triggers a "duty to inform" under some circumstances; in principle, the employee and any witnesses are expected to provide information in the context of internal investigations. While the employee is not compelled to incriminate him or herself, he or she also may not withhold work-related information that the employer legitimately wishes to protect, for the sole reason that it might incriminate him or her. The decision as to whether the employee must disclose information depends on a balancing of interests in the specific case.

Investigators and employers must strictly adhere to the permissible limits. This requires compliance with labour law, criminal law and data protection law.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

Indirectly involved employees may be interviewed as witnesses in the context of the investigation, as the employee has a duty of loyalty towards the employer originating from the employment relationship. However, they cannot be forced to do so (in contrast with criminal procedures). Any harmful act that could

be considered retaliation against witnesses in the context of violence or harassment or whistleblowing investigation is prohibited. In addition, the identity of any employees as witnesses is also covered by the principle of confidentiality.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Co-workers cannot be compelled to act as witnesses in a workplace investigation. Employees also have rights arising from the law that must be respected by the employers and investigators, such as the right to privacy or to remain silent, freedom of expression and communication. These rights must be protected during every step of the workplace investigation process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

All data processing must comply with the principles of article 5 GDPR (lawfulness, fairness, transparency, purpose limitation, data minimisation, accuracy, storage limitation and integrity). Personal data may only be collected and processed for specific, lawful purposes.

The admissibility of data processing depends on whether the suspicion relates to a criminal offence or another violation of the law. If the data processing is relevant to criminal law, article 10 GDPR or section 4(3) of the Austrian Data Protection Act (DSG) applies. If the investigations are exclusively to clarify violations under civil or labour law, such as an assertion of claims for damages or if they are general investigations to establish a criminal offence, the permissibility of data processing is based on article 6 or, for data covered by article 9 GDPR, on this provision.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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:

[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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The conditions applicable to gathering physical evidence mainly stem from the precedents of the Turkish Constitutional Court about employment disputes and the rules set forth under Turkish Law No. 6698 on the Protection of Personal Data (DPL). It is generally accepted that employers can gather physical evidence for certain legitimate purposes, such as disciplinary investigations, the prevention of bribery and corruption, fraud or theft, money laundering, and employee performance monitoring and compliance. In doing so, employers must, however, comply with the fundamental principles of the Turkish Constitutional Court as briefly described below:

- The grounds for the gathering of evidence must be legitimate. The definition of the legitimate interests of the employer may change depending on the characteristics of the business, workplace and employee job description, as well as the specific circumstances of the case. Therefore, it is advisable to carry out a balancing test between the legitimate interest the employer is seeking to protect and the employee's interest in the protection of their privacy.
- The collection activities must be proportionate, in the sense that the measure implemented by the employer must be appropriate and reasonably necessary to achieve the legitimate purpose, without infringing upon the fundamental rights and freedoms of the employees. For instance, e-mail monitoring to collect evidence may not be proportionate if it is determined that e-mails that are not related to the incident subject to investigation are also accessed. To achieve this, certain keywords or algorithms can be used while monitoring e-mails during a disciplinary investigation.
- The collection process must be necessary to achieve the purpose. In other words, the collection of physical evidence must only be carried out to the extent there are no other measures allowing the employer to achieve its purpose, such as witness testimony, workplace records, or examining the results of projects. If the purpose can be achieved through less invasive means, the collection of physical evidence may not comply with the principles established by the decisions of the Constitutional Court.

Separately, depending on the type of physical evidence collected, the collection process may lead to the processing of the concerned employees' personal data. Under the DPL, personal data collected in Turkey can only be processed if the explicit consent of the data subject is obtained; or the data is processed based on one of the exceptions to consent provided by the law. To the extent the data processing can be deemed to be based on the pursuit of a legitimate interest of the employer, it should also meet the following conditions:

- it should be the most convenient and efficient method to identify any employee wrongdoing to protect the legitimate interests of the company; and
- the data processing should not harm the fundamental rights and freedoms of the employees.

The employer should in any case comply with the obligation to inform employees before the processing of their data, through a privacy notice containing mandatory information required by the DPL.

In addition, as a general principle, the evidence-gathering process should always be conducted based on the assumption that the internal investigation can lead to litigation. Any evidence that will be used in litigation needs to have been gathered in compliance with the law. In both criminal and civil litigation, the courts will review each piece of evidence to confirm whether it was gathered through lawful methods and disregard any evidence that fails to comply with due process.

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, it is advisable to back up data, documents, emails and other records promptly to prevent their deletion. Admissibility depends on whether the data originates from personal or professional records and whether they are legally relevant. If internal investigations are carried out based on a specific suspicion of a criminal offence, it is the processing of legally relevant data. In general, the processing of professional emails or documents is permissible. If there is no professional connection, access to private files and documents is only permitted in exceptional cases.

If, for example, using a business email account for private purposes is not allowed, the employer can usually assume that the data processed is only "general" data within the meaning of article 6 GDPR and that such data processing is justified by a balancing of interests. However, if private use is allowed, the data may still be part of a special category within the meaning of article 9 GDPR. In such cases, the justification for its use must be based on one of the grounds explicitly mentioned in article 9(2) GDPR.

The employer must protect the employee's rights under section 16 of the ABGB and must consider the proportionality of the interference. Only the least restrictive means – the method that least interferes with the employee's rights – may be used to obtain the necessary information. The employer's interest in obtaining the information must outweigh the employee's interest in protecting his or her rights. The implementation or initiation of controls by the employer does not automatically constitute an interference with personal rights, as being subject to the employer's rights of control is part of the position as an employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

There is no explicit answer to this question. However, it is important to make a distinction between employees' possessions and files that are strictly personal and employees' possessions and files that are found on devices or files provided for company use. For the first category, the employer does not have the right to search employees' possessions and files. For the latter category though, justifications need to be established, by observing the requirements explained in question 7. Furthermore, the employers must also ensure that employees are fully and explicitly informed in advance of the monitoring operations, either through a provision included in the employment agreement, or in a separate notice or employee policy, the receipt of which should be duly acknowledged by the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The provisions of the Whistleblowing Directive must be respected. In Austria, these have been implemented through the Whistleblower Protection Act (HSchG). If the whistleblower or the persons concerned fall within the scope of the Directive, their identity must be protected. Only authorised persons may access the report. Retaliatory measures are invalid or must be reversed. Within a maximum of seven days, the whistleblower must receive a confirmation of his or her complaint. Feedback to the whistleblower must then be provided within a maximum of three months.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*

at Karatzas & Partners

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Although there is no specific legislation in Turkish law on whistleblowing, necessary mechanisms need to be implemented to ensure that whistleblowers and the whistleblowing process are kept confidential. In addition, whistleblowers must be encouraged and supported to be open about raising their concerns in good faith. A whistleblowing activity, when it amounts to raising a concern in good faith, must not be mistreated by the employer. Employers should also put in place protection mechanisms against the mistreatment of whistleblowers or retaliation towards them by other employees.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If the report and the whistleblower fall within the scope of the Whistleblowing Directive, his or her identity must be protected. From a data protection perspective, the principles of the DSGVO must be observed to protect the legitimate confidentiality of the individuals concerned.

Furthermore, the employer should ensure that information is only disclosed to trustworthy persons to avoid pre-judgements.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

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

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

[2] Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit

besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 202.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

As a general practice, workplace investigations need to be kept confidential for the integrity of the process. In some cases, employees can specifically request their identity or involvement be kept confidential. In such cases, additional measures need to be taken to protect confidentiality. In any case, obligations and rights arising from the DPL and Labour Law must be respected and complied with by the employer and the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The purpose of internal investigations would be jeopardised by fully informing a suspected employee beforehand, as it would allow him or her to hide or destroy possible evidence, plan his testimony or coordinate with other employees.

There is no legal requirement to inform the employee of the allegations or suspicions.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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.

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Informing the employee under investigation on the subject, purpose and possible consequences of the investigation need to be evaluated by the investigation team before the interview. As a general principle, the interviewer is expected to share the information he obtained on the case with the employee, and ask for confirmation or clarification on these matters. The employee under investigation may be subject to an interview to gain information or as a confrontation if there is concrete evidence. If the evidence in hand is not based on concrete and material grounds, it would be more appropriate not to lead the interview to a confession, but inform the employee of the possible allegations. However, if the available evidence is based on concrete and material grounds, the interviewer may confront the interviewee by sharing the information that was gathered during the investigation in an attempt to obtain a confession.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

When dealing with reports and persons covered by the HSchG, the provisions on identity protection must be followed. In all internal investigations, only authorised persons should receive information.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

It is possible to keep such information confidential. If this is the case, the investigation team should conduct the interview outside the workplace of the company. This is actually good practice applicable to all internal investigations, unless there is a particular reason that requires the meetings to be held at the company.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

—
Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

According to section 6(1) of the DSG, employees who have access to personal data in the course of their professional activities must maintain data confidentiality and continue to do so even after termination of their employment.

Non-disclosure agreements can generally be used to achieve this but are subject to certain restrictions. They may not be used to conceal criminal activity, violate the privacy rights of individuals, circumvent legal disclosure obligations, prevent the exercise of legal rights or contain clauses that violate existing laws, in particular data protection regulations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

It is crucial to keep the events and facts of a workplace investigation confidential for the integrity of the process. It may be necessary to consider appropriate confidentiality measures to protect the complainant, mitigate risks, and preserve evidence. Damage to the confidentiality of the case can prevent the investigation team from bringing the case to a correct and complete conclusion. Although the labour legislation imposes a general confidentiality obligation on employees, NDAs can still be used as supplementary documents that may emphasise the confidentiality obligations of employees in workplace investigations and provide additional contractual protections such as penalties if there is a breach.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

If a lawyer is involved in the investigation, communication between the lawyer and client is subject to legal professional privilege. These communications must not be disclosed. Any documents collected by an internal audit can be seized and used. However, a document created by a lawyer can only be seized. The same applies to other professional representatives of parties, such as notaries and auditors, as potential holders of professional secrecy.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Attorney-client privilege is attached at the time the attorney is hired as a legal representative. Attorney-client privilege, which is regulated under the Law of Criminal Procedure No. 5271 and the Attorney's Act No. 1136, covers not only the investigation process, but also the legal advice and counselling received before and after the investigation. The importance of this privilege is especially present in cases where judicial or administrative authorities are involved in the process. Documents and correspondence benefiting from attorney-client privilege can be protected and fall outside the scope of preventive measures such as search and seizures due to the right of defence.

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?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

In general, an employee is not entitled to have a representative present during investigations. However, he is free to reach out to the works council or independently contact a lawyer for advice. The employer must hear the works council upon his or her request on all matters concerning the interests of employees at the company. Once disciplinary proceedings begin, the employee has the right to be represented by a lawyer.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

Greek law does not specifically regulate the right to be accompanied or have legal representation during

internal investigations for private-sector employees.

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Yes, the employee under investigation has a right to be accompanied by his or her legal representative during the investigation. It is also essential that the employee under investigation is informed about his or her right to have a legal representative.

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?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The Austrian Labour Constitution Act (ArbVG) does not contain any provisions regarding workplace investigations. The employee has the right to address the works council but is not entitled to have the works council comply with his or her request.

The works council's opportunities for participation are conclusively regulated. Certain investigative or control measures may require the consent or co-determination of the works council.

Under section 96(1)3 ArbVG, the consent of the works council is required if the employer wishes to introduce and maintain control measures or technical systems for monitoring employees that affect human dignity, such as video surveillance or specific staff questionnaires. If there is no works council, the consent of each individual employee is required.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

L.4990/2022 explicitly states that the exercise of employee rights that refer to consulting from representatives or trade unions and protection against any detrimental measure that results from those consultations does not affect the implementation of any legal provisions. The autonomy of social partners and their right to enter into collective agreements regardless of the level of protection provided by L.4990/2022^[7] is also unaffected.

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

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

^[8] Law 4808/2021 art.14

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

An authorized trade union, if any, may have the right to be informed or involved in the investigation, depending on the terms of the collective bargaining agreement in place. Even in the absence of such a provision in the collective bargaining agreement, it would still be recommended to inform the trade union of the investigation as a courtesy. We do not have works councils under Turkish employment law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

There is no additional support for the employees concerned. However, the employer may offer support measures to the employees to ensure better cooperation. The choice of support measures is at the employer's discretion. For example, the employer could offer to bear lawyer's fees, if the employee is cooperative. Such decisions must always be made on a case-by-case basis.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

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

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

[9] Law 4990/2022 art.17

[10] Law 4990/2022 art.19

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

[12] Law 4808/2021 art.13

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The employees involved in the investigation should be granted their personal needs (such as refreshments or access to the bathroom), as well as translation services or transportation, if needed. A breach of these rights or needs during the process may constitute a violation of the law and adversely affect the validity of the results to be obtained from the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer must decide how to deal with this information. Possible options are to initiate separate and unrelated investigations or to extend the ongoing investigations.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

If an unrelated matter is revealed during the investigation, an independent assessment needs to be made as to whether this new matter requires to be included in the same internal investigation, or a separate/new one should be commenced.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

19. What if the employee under investigation raises a

grievance during the investigation?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Provided the employer complies with labour law and data protection regulations, internal investigations are lawful and are not regarded as administrative or judicial proceedings. If legal consequences for not cooperating, such as dismissal, are threatened by the employer or his investigators, the offence of coercion under section 105 of the Austrian Criminal Code could be fulfilled.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

Employees under investigation frequently raise grievances during investigation procedures that are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. The grievances raised by the employee under investigation are examined by the employees responsible for the investigation. They may either pause the relevant proceedings and review the grievance, especially if the claims of the employee under investigation are linked to a breach of his or her data or hearing rights, or they may continue the investigation.

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

If, during the investigation, the employee under investigation raises a grievance, the investigator will be expected to temporarily stop the investigation to assess the situation. The investigation team will evaluate

whether the employee is raising a grievance as a defence mechanism or in good faith and with sincere concerns. If the subject of the grievance is related to the pending investigation, the investigation may be extended to cover this new item. Otherwise, a new investigation can be initiated by the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The involved employee's sick leave does not affect the internal investigation. Most investigative measures can be carried out without the employee's presence.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



Switzerland

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

The time spent on the internal investigation by the employee should be counted as working time^[1]. The general statutory and internal company principles on sick leave apply. Sick leave for which the respective employee is not responsible must generally be compensated (article 324a paragraph 1 and article 324b, Swiss Code of Obligations). During certain periods of sick leave (blocking period), the employer may not ordinarily terminate the employment contract; however, immediate termination for cause remains possible.

The duration of the blocking period depends on the employee's seniority, amounting to 30 days in the employee's first year of service, 90 days in the employee's second to ninth year of service and 180 days thereafter (article 336c paragraph 1 (lit. c), Swiss Code of Obligations).

[1] Ullin Streiff/Adrian von Kaenel/Roger Rudolph, Arbeitsvertrag, Praxiskommentar zu Art. 319–362 OR, 7. A. 2012, Art. 328b N 8 OR.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The employee's participation in the investigation is vital for a fair assessment and to ensure that the employee has been allowed to defend himself or herself against the allegations. As such, every reasonable effort must be made by the employer to adjust the investigation process so that the employee can take part in the investigation. For example, if the employee goes off sick and thus cannot attend the investigation interviews or disciplinary hearings, the investigation should be carried out as much as possible without resorting to the employee in question, by initially exhausting the other available options (such as conducting interviews or disciplinary hearings with other available witnesses). However, if the employee's absence takes longer than is reasonably expected or the matter at hand must be dealt with urgently, the employer may consider concluding the investigation and determining the next steps based on the information at hand. In such a case, it is recommended to explain in the investigation report the reasons why the employee could not take part in the investigation process (ie, why an interview or disciplinary hearing, etc, could not have been arranged with the employee) along with supporting documentation evidencing the employer's efforts to involve the employee in the investigation process and the employee's excuse for not participating interviews or disciplinary hearings.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Private investigations differ from criminal or regulatory investigations. Nevertheless, even for internal investigations, it is advisable to collect evidence in a way that can be admitted in court, as it may have to be presented to the authorities during the investigation process. Generally, any evidence obtained in the course of an internal investigation may be admitted in subsequent administrative or judicial proceedings.

If the evidence is not voluntarily surrendered, seizure or confiscation is possible. Since official proceedings are often lengthy, suspension is not always recommended.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

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

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

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

^[13] Law 4808/2018 art.10

Last updated on 03/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

If the issues being examined during an investigation are also subject to parallel criminal or regulatory investigation, the workplace investigation will probably be stayed. This is primarily because parallel criminal or regulatory investigations would necessitate a more comprehensive examination and public bodies overseeing such investigations have a broader legal prerogative to gather evidence. It is, therefore, advisable to stay the internal investigation to not interfere with the criminal or regulatory authorities. If a prosecutor or a court requires the employer to give evidence or share certain documents, the police can compel the employer to share evidence. Regulatory bodies may also ask the employer to share evidence

and the powers conferred on such regulatory bodies will be a determining factor in whether they can compel the employer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employee has no general right to be informed of the results of an investigation. However, if the employer is considering consequences under labour law based on the result of the investigation, such as termination or dismissal, the employee must be informed accordingly.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

In general, the employee under investigation should be adequately informed about the allegations and findings to be able to defend him or herself. If no legal action will be taken against the employee under investigation as a result of the investigation, the employee may be notified regarding the findings and the outcome of the investigation. If the employee will be subject to a legal or administrative action (ie, warning, reprimand, or termination of employment), the formal requirements stemming from the Labour Law will need to be followed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer should determine the intended recipients and format of the report in advance. In many cases, it may be advisable to publish only the results of the investigation to protect the privacy and reputation of the individuals concerned, as this may help to minimise any potential negative impact on them.

However, under certain circumstances or due to legal requirements, full disclosure of the investigation report may be required, especially if transparency and disclosure are necessary to maintain public or investor confidence.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

However, if the outcome of the investigation leads to the imposition of disciplinary measures, the right of

the employee under investigation to request the whole investigation report, to aid in their defence is enhanced. Moreover, if a complaint is made in bad faith or is unfounded, it may be supported that the employee under investigation is entitled to receive full documentation so he or she can seek adequate legal protection or file an action before the courts.

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

There is no legal requirement for the disclosure of the investigation report in full. If the investigation report needs to be submitted to the court, public institutions or other third parties, measures may need to be taken to protect confidentiality or to comply with the confidentiality requests of the persons participating in the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

The employer may impose consequences under labour law. Consequences may include verbal or written

warnings, transfers or other disciplinary measures. The employer may also implement training or educational measures if the issue is due to the employee's lack of knowledge. In serious cases, besides dismissal without notice – for example, if the employer seeks damages – legal action (civil or criminal) may be taken against the employee.

Last updated on 29/09/2023

Greece

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The employer may take various legal remedies against the employee whose infringement is discovered as a result of the internal investigation. Depending on the outcome of the investigation, the employer:

- may provide the employee with a written warning requesting him or her not to repeat the same

conduct;

- terminate the employment relationship based on either just cause, without paying any compensation immediately, or valid reason by observing statutory notice periods or making payment in lieu of notice and paying severance compensation if applicable; or
- not take any action if the investigation concludes that no fault is attributable to the employee.

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?



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

It is up to management to decide which results should be disclosed and to whom. It is important to know who the persons concerned are and who has an interest in disclosure.

From a legal perspective, disclosure must follow the GDPR. Internal policies can specify how the results are to be handled. Works Council Agreements (WCAs) may also contain regulations on how to deal with internal investigations and the disclosure of results.

There is no requirement to publish the results of the investigation, but it may be advisable to cooperate with the authorities. This is particularly the case if the employer has suffered damage or is himself threatened with prosecution. The release of investigation results can be compelled through the courts.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

Last updated on 03/04/2023



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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

Investigation reports may be disclosed in potential lawsuits or judicial proceedings. Therefore, the investigation report must demonstrate that a detailed and objective investigation has been carried out. Courts may also request that the interview records be disclosed to them, failing which, the courts may resort to an adverse inference in civil proceedings. Criminal courts can also ask the interview records to be disclosed if this would be necessary for reaching the truth. Failure to disclose may entail criminal responsibility under certain conditions.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

Data protection law requires that personal data should not be kept longer than necessary for the purpose it was collected. Once the purpose of the internal investigation is fulfilled and the data is no longer needed, it should be deleted or anonymised. Regulations regarding this matter may also be subject to WCAs or internal policies. In any case, it is advisable to keep the results for as long as they may be needed in possible subsequent administrative or judicial proceedings.

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

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

There is no provision in the legislation setting forth a specific duration for keeping the outcome of the investigation findings in personnel files. However, based on general principles, the outcome of the investigation can remain on the employee's personnel files as long as the employer has a lawful interest in such processing without unnecessarily harming the privacy rights of the employee.

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



Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*
at GERLACH

This relates to the severity of the error. Data protection violations can lead to fines by the data protection authority or claims for damages. If consequences under labour law, such as dismissal, have taken place due to erroneous investigations or incorrect results, the employee concerned can assert claims under labour law or seek damages.

Furthermore, there may be consequences under criminal law. This is particularly the case if documents have been falsified in the course of the investigation. It is, therefore, crucial that employers exercise diligence and due process in internal investigations. Investigations must be conducted transparently and lawfully.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Greece

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

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

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

Moreover, administrative fines may also be imposed if the employer does not comply with the legal requirements concerning the prevention of violence and harassment in the workplace.

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

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

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

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

Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*
at Paksoy

The nature of legal exposure is very much dependent on the legal action the employer has taken after the

investigation. The employer may be subject to a wrongful termination lawsuit to be filed by the employee, which may result in the payment of compensation to the employee of between eight and 12 months' salary, if the court concludes that the termination is wrongful. This may also include monetary and moral damages claims. If no termination has taken place, the employee may terminate his or her employment with just cause if the employer has erred in its neutral fact-finding mission and this affects the employee. The employee may also file a criminal complaint to the extent that the investigation findings incriminate the employee in error.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Austria

Michaela Gerlach
Sonia Ben Brahim
GERLACH



Greece

Angeliki Tsatsi
Anna Pechlivanidi
Pinelopi Anyfanti
Katerina Basta
Karatzas & Partners



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



Turkey

Elvan Aziz
Gülce Saydam Pehlivan
Emre Kotil
Osman Pepeoğlu
Paksoy