

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Mainly, the Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002). In addition, the following also have relevance in connection to a workplace investigation: the Employment Contracts Act (55/2001), the Criminal Code (39/1889), the Act on Occupational Safety and Health Enforcement and Cooperation on Occupational Safety and Health at Workplaces (44/2006), the Act on Equality between Women and Men (609/1986) and the Non-discrimination Act (1325/2014). In addition, the employer's own policies must be taken into consideration while conducting a workplace investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

When the employer becomes aware of possible misconduct, the employer must commence an investigation immediately, in practice within about two weeks. The information may come to the employer's knowledge via, for example, the employer's own observations, from the complainant or their colleagues or an employee representative.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

There is no legislation on temporary suspension in the event of a workplace investigation or similar. In some situations, the employer may relieve the employee from their working obligation with pay for a short period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

Under section 11 of the EO, an employer may suspend an employee without pay pending a decision as to whether the employee should be summarily dismissed (up to 14 days) or pending the outcome of any criminal proceedings against the employee arising out of his or her employment (up to the conclusion of the criminal proceedings). If an employee is suspended as above, however, the employee may terminate his or her employment without notice or payment in lieu of notice.

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

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employer must conduct the investigation, but the actual work can be done either by the employer's personnel or by an external investigator, for example, a law firm. Either way, there are no formal criteria for the persons executing the investigation; however, impartiality is required from the person conducting the investigation

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employee does not have a legal right to stop the investigation. The employer must fulfil its obligation to investigate the alleged misconduct.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

There is no legislation on a witness's role in investigations. However, the legislation on occupational safety requires that employees must report any irregularities they observe. Depending on the situation, participating in the investigation may also be part of the person's work duties, role or position, in which case the employer may require the employee to contribute to clarifying the situation. However, there is no formal obligation to act as a witness, and there is no legislation regarding the protection of witnesses. If a witness wishes, they may have, for example, an employee representative as a support person during the hearing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

That said, in general terms, an employer should not compel any employee to testify against a co-worker, particularly if such a co-worker is a senior colleague, as evidence provided under compulsion may not be helpful to the investigation.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Generally, the basic principles set out by the GDPR and the Finnish Data Protection Act apply to data processing in connection with investigations, including evidence gathering: there must be a legal basis for processing, personal data may only be processed and stored when and for as long as necessary considering the purposes of processing, etc.

Additionally, if physical evidence concerns the electronic communications (such as emails and online chats) of an employee, gathering evidence is subject to certain restrictions based on Finnish ePrivacy and employee privacy laws. As a general rule, an employee's electronic communications accounts, including those provided by the employer for work purposes, may not be accessed and electronic communications may not be searched or reviewed by the employer. In practice, the employer may access such electronic correspondence only in limited situations stipulated in the Act on Protection of Privacy in Working Life (759/2004), or by obtaining case-specific consent from the employee, which is typically not possible in internal investigations, particularly concerning the employee suspected of wrongdoing.

However, monitoring data flow strictly between the employee and the employer's information systems (eg, the employee saving data to USB sticks, using printers) is allowed under Finnish legislation, provided that employee emails, chats, etc, are not accessed and monitored. If documentation is unrelated to electronic communications, it also may be reviewed by the employer. Laptops, paper archives and other similar company documentation considered "physical evidence" may be investigated while gathering evidence on the condition that any private documentation, communications, pictures or other content of an employee are not accessed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

[1] PDPO section 2.

[2] PDPO Schedule 1.

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

[4] Ibid at paragraph 2.3.3.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Only the police can search employees' possessions (assuming that the prerequisites outlined in the legislation are met).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

^[1] Usually upon execution of a warrant.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

In respect of data protection, the processing of personal data in whistleblowing systems is considered by the Finnish Data Protection Ombudsman (DPO) as requiring a data protection impact assessment (DPIA).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

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 DSG 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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Concerning a workplace investigation, there is no specific legislation in force at the moment regarding confidentiality obligations. All normal legal confidentiality obligations (eg, obligations outlined in the Trade Secrets Act (595/2018)), and if using an external investigator, the confidentiality obligations outlined in the agreement between the employer and the external investigator, apply. Attorneys-at-law always have strict confidentiality obligations as per the Advocates Act (496/1958).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

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

about the regulatory enquiry to anyone including those who are subject to the workplace investigation. For example, section 378 of the Securities and Futures Ordinance (SFO) imposes such a secrecy obligation on anyone who is under investigation or assists the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) in an investigation.[\[4\]](#)

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The process must be transparent and impartial, and therefore all the information that may influence the conclusions made during the investigation should be shared with the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

An employer's internal policies or the employment contract may provide that an employee under investigation should be given certain information concerning the allegations raised against him or her. Such policies or terms should be followed and failure to do so may result in a claim for breach of contract or constructive dismissal by the employee. Even where there are no express provisions, the employer still owes an implied obligation of trust and confidence towards the employee at common law, which requires the employer not to, without reasonable and proper cause, conduct itself in a manner calculated and likely to destroy or seriously damage the relationship of confidence and trust between itself and the employee.^[1] In the context of an internal investigation, the implied duty would require the employer to conduct the investigation and reach its findings reasonably and rationally following the evidence available and in good faith. This would normally require that sufficient information about the allegations made against the employee be provided to him or her such that he or she has the opportunity to properly respond to the allegations before any disciplinary action is taken or any decision about his or her employment is made.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

See question 11, there is no protection of anonymity as the process must be transparent to the parties involved.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Yes, however, the need for an NDA is assessed always on a case-by-case basis.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*

at Slaughter and May

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The privilege of investigation materials concerns a rather limited amount of cases. In practice, materials may be considered privileged in connection with the litigation process under the Procedural Code (4/1734). For example, communications between a client and an attorney may attract protection against forcible public disclosure.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

Legal professional privilege may attach to investigation materials if they are generated for the sole or dominant purpose of giving or obtaining legal advice (legal advice privilege); or created with the sole or

dominant purpose of either obtaining or giving advice about or obtaining evidence to be used in an actual or reasonably contemplated litigation (litigation privilege).[1] Legal advice privilege applies to confidential communications between lawyers and their clients, whereas litigation privilege may extend to communications between lawyers, clients and third parties. The employer may withhold disclosure of any materials that are subject to either legal advice or litigation privilege.

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employee under investigation has a right to have a support person present (eg, a lawyer or an employee representative) during the hearings and a right to assistance in preparing written statements.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

A works council or a trade union does not have a role in the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

They can request assistance, for example, from an occupational health and safety representative, a shop steward or the occupational healthcare provider.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

If they are related to the work or workplace, the employer will handle the emerging matters separately. In internal investigations, the employer is allowed to use any material legally available.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

If the nature of the grievance relates to the employer's obligations to handle such matters in general, the grievance will be investigated either separately or as a part of the ongoing investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

As a general rule, sick leave does not prevent an investigation from progressing. Depending on the nature of the sickness, the employee can attend hearings and take part in the procedure. If the sickness prevents the employee from participating, the employer can put the process on hold temporarily.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Regardless of a possible criminal investigation, the employer must run its internal workplace investigation

without unnecessary delay. A workplace investigation and a criminal investigation are two separate processes and can be ongoing simultaneously, so the criminal process does not require the workplace investigation to be stayed. Thus, parallel investigations are to be considered as two separate matters. The police may only obtain evidence or material from the company or employer if strict requirements for equipment searches are met after a request for investigation has been submitted to the police.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employer's conclusions from the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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.

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employee under investigation may only be informed of the conclusions.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

^[2] PDPO sections 20 and 60.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

The employer decides whether misconduct has taken place or not. Depending on the case, the employer may recommend a workplace conciliation in which the parties try to find a solution that can be accepted by both sides. The employer may choose to give an oral reprimand or a written warning. If the legal conditions are met, the employer may also terminate the employment agreement.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

If the outcome of the investigation reveals that misconduct has been committed by the employee, the employer may consider whether it should allow the employee to defend him or herself against such findings. If the employment contract or relevant internal policies specify a right to be heard on the part of the employee through a disciplinary hearing before any actions can be taken against him or her, such procedures should be followed.

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

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

[1] EO section 11(1).

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

In general, investigation materials, including findings, that includes personal data should only be processed by the personnel of the organisation who are responsible for internal investigations. However, it may in some situations be required by applicable legislation that findings are disclosed to competent authorities for the performance of their duties, such as conducting investigations in connection with malpractice and violations of the law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

Having said that, the employer should be aware of certain statutory disclosure requirements that may become applicable as a result of the matters revealed during the workplace investigation. For example, if the investigation reveals or gives rise to any knowledge or suspicion that any property represents the proceeds of an indictable offence^[1], drug trafficking^[2], or terrorism^[3], the employer is required to report its knowledge or suspicion, together with any matter on which that knowledge or suspicion is based, to the JFIU as soon as is reasonably practicable (even where the investigation has not yet been concluded). Employers who are licensed corporations must also provide the SFC with information about whether departing licensed employees were the subject of an internal investigation in the six months prior to his/her departure. If the internal investigation commences after the departure of the licensed employee, the licensed corporation should notify the SFC as soon as practicable^[4].

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

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

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

^[3] UNATMO section 12(1).

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

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

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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.

Last updated on 29/09/2023



Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinn, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

Please see question 7. The outcome of the investigation involving personal data may be retained only for as long as is necessary considering the purposes of the processing. In general, the retention of investigation-related data may be necessary while the investigation is still ongoing and even then the requirements of data minimization and accuracy should be considered. The data concerning the outcome of an investigation should be registered to the employee's record merely to the extent necessary in light of the employment relationship or potential disciplinary measures. In this respect, the applicable retention time depends on labour law-related rights and limitations, considering eg, the applicable periods for filing a suit.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*
at Roschier

There are no regulations regarding the actual investigation process. Therefore, the employer cannot be accused of procedural errors as such. However, once the matter has been adequately investigated, the employer must decide whether or not misconduct has taken place. If the employer considers that misconduct has taken place, the employer must take adequate measures for remedying the situation. Failure to adequately conduct the investigation could result in criminal sanctions being imposed on the employer as an organisation or the employer's representative, or damages.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

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

^[2] EO sections 9 and 32K.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Austria

Michaela Gerlach
Sonia Ben Brahim
GERLACH



Finland

Anu Waaralinna
Mari Mohsen
Roschier



Hong Kong

Wynne Mok
Jason Cheng
Audrey Li
Slaughter and May