

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?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

- The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (as amended)
- The Criminal Code Act
- Penal Code Law
- Money Laundering (Prohibition) Act 2011 (as amended)
- Freedom of Information Act 2011
- Terrorism (Prevention) Act 2013
- Independent Corrupt Practices and other related offences Act 2000
- Code of Conduct Bureau and Tribunal Act
- Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020
- Nigerian Code of Corporate Governance 2018
- Economic Financial Crime Commission (Establishment) Act 2004
- Investment Securities Act 2007
- Central Bank of Nigeria Act 2007
- Banks and Other Financial Institutions Act 2020
- Whistleblowing Programme under the Ministry of Finance

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

There are essentially two phases in a workplace investigation: the fact-finding phase and the administrative proceeding.

The fact-finding phase of workplace investigations is usually governed by the internal policies of the employer, save for investigations relating to gender-based sexual harassment in the workplace. Republic Act No. 11313, otherwise known as the Safe Spaces Act, sets the parameters for these kinds of

investigations.

Philippine case law recognises the right of an employer to conduct investigations for other acts of misconduct in the workplace in the exercise of its management prerogative. The Supreme Court has held that it is an employer's right to investigate acts of wrongdoing by employees, and employees involved in such investigations cannot simply claim that employers are out to get them.

After the fact-finding aspect of the investigation, if the employer decides it has sufficient grounds to proceed to full-blown administrative proceedings, it needs to comply with the due process requirements outlined under the Philippine Labor Code. These requirements are:

- a first notice, or notice to explain, informing the employee of the charges against him or her;
- an opportunity for the employee to be heard; and
- a final notice on the outcome of the administrative action.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Workplace investigations in Sweden are governed by several rules and regulations. Listed below are the central legislation and regulations that govern a workplace investigation related to alleged employee misconduct.

- The Swedish Discrimination Act (2008:567).
- The Swedish Work Environment Act (1977:1160), which is complemented by the Swedish Work Environment Authority's other statutes.[\[1\]](#)
- The Swedish Whistleblowing Act (2021:890).

If a workplace investigation has been initiated after the receipt of a report filed through a reporting channel established under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, that law applies provided that the report has been filed by a person who may report under the Act and provided that the subject of the report falls under the material scope of the Act. The Swedish Whistleblowing Act implements Directive (EU) 2019/1937 on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law and has been given a wide material scope in Sweden. The Swedish Whistleblowing Act may apply if the reported irregularity concerns breaches of certain EU laws or if the reported irregularity is of public interest.

In addition to the regulations mentioned above, certain data protection legislation may affect workplace investigations by restricting what personal data may be processed. Such data protection legislation includes the following:

- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons concerning the processing of personal data and the free movement of such data (the GDPR);
- the Swedish Supplementary Data Protection Act (2018:218);
- the Swedish Supplementary Data Protection Regulation (2018:219);
- Regulation DIFS:2018:2 on the processing of personal data relating to criminal convictions or offences. This regulation governs the processing of personal data relating to criminal convictions or suspected criminal offences in internal workplace investigations that are not governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act.[\[2\]](#)

The above-mentioned legislation and regulations may overlap in many aspects and it is therefore important before starting an investigation, as well as during an investigation, to assess which rules and regulations apply to the situation at hand. Another aspect of this is that many issues that can arise during an investigation are not regulated by law or other legislation. If the investigation is a non-whistleblowing investigation there are limited rules on exactly how and by whom the investigation should be carried out.

A Swedish law firm that undertakes a workplace investigation also has to adhere to the Swedish Bar Association's Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct includes additional considerations, mainly ethical, which will not be addressed in this submission. Furthermore, this submission will not focus on investigations following an employee's possible misappropriation of proprietary information or breach of the Swedish Trade Secrets Act (2018:558). Investigations into such irregularities are often conducted to gather evidence and these investigations include the same or similar investigative measures used in other investigations, such as interviews with employees and IT-forensic searches, but also infringement investigations carried out by the authorities or other measures by the police.

[1] Mainly Systematic Work Environment Management (AFS 2001:1), Organisational and Social Work Environment (AFS 2015:4) and Violence and Menaces in the Working Environment (AFS 1993:2)

[2] Under Section 2 item 4 of DIFS 2018:2, personal data relating to criminal convictions or suspected criminal offences may only be processed if the personal data concerns serious misconduct, such as bribery, corruption, financial fraud or serious threats to the environment, health and safety, by an individual who is in a leading position or who is considered key personnel within the company. The processing of personal data received in a report or collected during an investigation governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act is instead governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, which complements the GDPR and the supplementing Swedish act and regulation stated in item (ii) and (iii) above.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*

at Villaraza & Angangco

Workplace investigations are normally commenced either through a complaint filed by other employees in the workplace or by HR or other representatives of management.

Under the Safe Spaces Act, employers are required to commence an investigation and decide on complaints regarding gender-based sexual harassment, within ten days of the complaint being brought to their attention. For other workplace misconduct, management is given wide discretion regarding the means and method by which the workplace investigation may be carried out.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*

at Mannheimer Swartling

An investigation can be initiated in several ways. It is usually as a result of whistleblowing or a report on work environment deficiencies, or through other channels (eg, HR, the police, media coverage).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

at Bär & Karrer

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

For an internal investigation to be initiated, there must be a reasonable suspicion (grounds).^[1] If no such grounds exist, the employer must ask the informant for further or more specific information. If no grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the case must be closed. If grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the appropriate investigative steps can be initiated by a formal investigation request from the company management.^[2]

^[1] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 21.

^[2] Klaus Moosmayer, *Compliance, Praxisleitfaden für Unternehmen*, 2. A. München 2015, N 314.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

A preventive suspension pending investigation is allowed under the law, provided that the continued employment of the subject of the investigation poses a serious and imminent threat to the life or property of the employer or other employees. Additionally, the period of preventive suspension pending investigation should not last longer than 30 days. However, should the employer wish to extend this period, the employer must pay the employee's wages and other benefits. The employee is under no obligation to reimburse the amount paid to them during the extension if the employer should, later on, decide to dismiss the employee after the completion of the process.

In practice, the notice of preventive suspension is issued simultaneously with the first notice or the notice to explain after the employer has conducted its fact-finding investigation and has reason to believe that the employee must be held accountable for his or her actions.

Since placing an employee under preventive suspension requires the existence of a serious and imminent threat to the life or property of the employer or other employees, some employers opt to place the employee or employees involved on agreed paid leave. This will allow the employer to conduct an unhampered workplace investigation while the investigated employee is still able to receive his or her full salary during this period. The exact period of paid leave may be agreed upon by the employer and the employee, but ideally it should not last for more than thirty days.



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

In general, an employee in the private sector may be temporarily suspended for a short period with pay and other benefits during a workplace investigation. The room for suspension without pay is, by contrast, very limited. An applicable collective bargaining agreement may impose additional restrictions on the right to temporarily suspend an employee. The suspension should be limited in time and only be in force during the investigation, but can be repeated for (multiple) additional short periods if necessary to conclude the investigation. An assessment needs to be made on a case-by-case basis as suspension in some cases may be considered unlawful. If not executed with sufficient consideration of the employee's interests, it may be considered a constructive dismissal or a breach of the employer's work environment obligations. If the employee is unionised, trade unions sometimes request that the employer initiates consultations as part of a decision to suspend an employee.

In the public sector, the right to suspension is limited. There are also special regulations regarding the suspension of certain employees, for example, employees who are employed as permanent judges.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

conducting an internal investigation.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Under the Safe Spaces Act, an employer should create an independent internal mechanism or a committee on decorum and investigation to investigate and address complaints of gender-based sexual harassment, which should:

- adequately represent the management, the employees from the supervisory rank, the rank-and-file employees, and the union, if any;
- designate a woman as its head and no less than half of its members should be women;
- be composed of members who are impartial and not connected or related to the alleged perpetrator;
- investigate and decide on the complaints within 10 days or less upon receipt thereof;
- observe due process;
- protect the complainant from retaliation; and
- guarantee confidentiality to the greatest extent possible.

For other types of offences, it is the prerogative of management as to who will conduct the investigation and how it will be conducted, provided the proceedings remain impartial.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the workplace investigation falls under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, the investigation has to be conducted by independent and autonomous persons or entities designated under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act as competent to investigate reports.

If the workplace investigation is not governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, there are no minimum qualification requirements. When appointing an investigator, one should consider who would be most suitable in the given situation. For example, it may in some situations be more suitable to have an external investigator to ensure impartiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

There is generally no legal remedy for an employee to stop a workplace investigation as it is the prerogative of management to conduct it. Nevertheless, if the employee alleges violation of any specific law or contractual provision in the conduct of the investigation, the employee may be able to seek judicial relief for violation of the law or contract, and ask for interim relief.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

No. It should, however, be noted that the employee under investigation may claim a right to rectification under article 16 of the GDPR and its right to object to processing under article 21 of the GDPR. This may give the employee under investigation an undesirable opportunity to withhold evidence and obstruct or impede the investigation. The risk of these rights being exercised is, however, considered to be low.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

The accused could theoretically request a court to stop the investigation, for instance, by arguing that there is no reason for the investigation and that the investigation infringes the employee's personality rights. However, if the employer can prove that there were grounds for reasonable suspicion and is conducting the investigation properly, it is unlikely that such a request would be successful.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Neither the employer nor the employee subject of the investigation can compel co-workers to act as a witness. There is no specific law for whistleblowers or employees who act as witnesses during an investigation. Nevertheless, the employer can have its own whistleblower policy.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

In general, yes, employees in Sweden have a far-reaching duty of loyalty toward their employers. This includes, among other things, a duty to truthfully answer an employer's questions and to inform the employer of events that may be of interest to the employer. An employee's obligation to assist is, however, more limited when assistance would entail self-incrimination.

A person acting as a witness under an investigation governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act will be protected by confidentiality. Personal data and details that could reveal the identity of a witness may not be disclosed without authorisation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

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

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



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The procedure for gathering physical evidence is governed primarily by company policy. Nevertheless, the Data Privacy Act of the Philippines protects all data subjects from unlawful processing of their personal information without consent.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

To the extent the gathering of physical evidence includes the processing of personal data, please see question 1.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Subject to the employees' reasonable expectation of privacy, gathering physical evidence within the premises of the workplace and through company-issued property has been upheld to be legally permissible in pursuit of the employer's right to conduct work-related investigations. The search, however, should be limited to the alleged acts complained of and must not be used as a fishing expedition to find incriminating information about the erring employee.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

An employer can search an employee's personal possessions (eg, handbag, pockets and locker) if the employer has a legitimate interest in a search. This could, for example, include a reasonable suspicion of theft of employer property. Furthermore, an employer may search, but not continually monitor, an employee's computer and email provided that it is in accordance with GDPR requirements. For the processing to be lawful under the GDPR, the employer has to establish a purpose and a legal basis for the processing of personal data. Furthermore, data subjects must have received information on the legal basis for and purpose of the processing of personal data beforehand. If the data subjects have not received such information, the employer's right to process their data is limited. However, if the employer has reasonable grounds to believe that trade secrets or similar has been copied and stolen, no such requirements would typically apply.

Investigations into an employee's possessions may, under certain circumstances, also be carried out by the Swedish authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since there is no specific law that governs whistleblowing, matters that involve whistleblowing will be governed by company policy.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act governs the investigation, additional considerations apply relating to who may investigate a reported irregularity (see question 4) and the duty of confidentiality and restrictions on

access to and disclosure of personal data in investigations (see questions 6, 10 and 11), as well as the rights and protections of whistleblowers.

As regards the rights and protections of whistleblowers, the following can be noted. A person reporting in a reporting channel governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act is protected against retaliation and restrictive measures. Thus, companies are prohibited from preventing or trying to prevent a person from reporting, and retaliating against a person who reports. Furthermore, a reporting person will not be held liable for breach of confidentiality for collecting the reported information if the person had reasonable grounds to believe that it was necessary to submit the report to expose irregularities. Under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, any person reporting irregularities in a reporting channel established under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act may also report irregularities to designated Swedish authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since the right to investigate ultimately belongs to the employer, it may impose strict confidentiality obligations upon the individuals involved, not only to ensure unhampered investigation proceedings but also and more importantly for the protection of the company and employees involved.



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the persons or entities handling the investigation have a duty of confidentiality and may not, without permission, disclose any information that could reveal the identity of the reporting person, any person subject to the report or any other person mentioned in the report or during the investigation of the report. Access to personal data is limited to designated competent entities or persons. Investigative material including personal data may not be shared with other persons or entities during the investigation. Once the investigation has reached actionable conclusions, investigative material may be shared with other persons or entities, such as HR or the police, provided that such sharing is necessary to take action on the outcome of the investigation. Investigative material may also be shared if it is necessary for the use of reports as evidence in legal proceedings or under the law or other regulations.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act does not apply, there are no particular confidentiality obligations for employers. Yet, an employer needs to consider what information is suitable to share during an investigation, how this is done and to whom it is shared. An employer must also respect employees' privacy in line with what is generally considered good practice in the labour market. This means that an employer should be careful as to what sensitive and personal information is shared during an investigation. Furthermore, the spreading of damaging information (even if true) about an employee to a wider group may be a criminal offence under the Swedish Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

[\[2\]](#) Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute*, p. 202.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

During the fact-finding stage of the investigation, the employees under investigation are not generally entitled to information concerning the conduct of the investigation. It is the prerogative of management to involve the employee under investigation during the fact-finding stage. When, however, the employer determines that an administrative disciplinary process must proceed, the employee's right to due process attaches. As such, due process includes the right to be informed of the grounds relied upon by the employer and the opportunity to be heard. The first notice or notice to explain should specifically inform the employee of the charge against him or her.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

According to article 14 of the GDPR, no information must be provided. The exemption in article 14.5(b) applies to the extent the obligation to provide such information is likely to render impossible or seriously impair the objectives of the processing of the personal data of the employee under investigation (ie, to diligently investigate the suspected irregularity).

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, information about where the personal data processed originates from may not be provided under article 14 of the GDPR, as the personal data must remain confidential subject to obligations under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act.

In addition to the above, an investigation should, to the extent possible and suitable, be characterised by the principles in ECHR (particularly articles 6 and 8). The employee under investigation should, among other things, be presented with sufficient information to safeguard his or her interests and be allowed to

respond to the allegations. The investigation must also be compliant with the work environment responsibilities that the employer has concerning the involved parties (see questions 17 and 20).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

As a result of the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), employees under investigation have certain procedural rights. These include, in principle, the right of the accused to be heard. In this context, the accused has the right to be informed at the beginning of the questioning about the subject of the investigation and at least the main allegations and they must be allowed to share their view and provide exculpatory evidence.^[1] The employer, on the other hand, is not obliged to provide the employee with existing evidence, documents, etc, before the start of the questioning.^[2]

Covert investigations in which employees are involved in informal or even private conversations to induce them to provide statements are not compatible with the data-processing principles of good faith and the requirement of recognisability, according to article 4 of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection.^[3]

Also, rights to information arise from the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. In principle, the right to information (article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) is linked to a corresponding request for information by the concerned person and the existence of data collection within the meaning of article 3 (lit. g), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. Insofar as the documents from the internal investigation recognisably relate to a specific person, there is in principle a right to information concerning these documents. Subject to certain conditions, the right to information may be denied, restricted or postponed by law (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). For example, such documents and reports may also affect the confidentiality and protection interests of third parties, such as other employees. Based on the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employer is required to protect them by taking appropriate measures (eg, by making appropriate redactions before handing out copies of the respective documents (article 9 paragraph 1 (lit. b), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection)).^[4] Furthermore, the employer may refuse, restrict or defer the provision of information where the company's interests override the employee's, and not disclose personal data to third parties (article 9 paragraph 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). The right to information is also not subject to the statute of limitations, and individuals may waive their right to information in advance (article 8 paragraph 6, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). If there are corresponding requests, the employer must generally grant access, or provide a substantiated decision on the restriction of the right of access, within 30 days (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 paragraph 4, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection).

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

^[2] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 390.

^[3] Roger Rudolph, *Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht*, SJZ 114/2018, p. 390.

^[4] Claudia Götz Staehelin, *Unternehmensinterne Untersuchungen*, 2019, p. 37.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The identity of the complainant, witnesses and sources of information may be kept confidential under the employer's policies.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, their identity must be kept confidential under the duty of confidentiality. If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act does not apply, their identity can to a large extent be kept confidential.

It can also be noted that a workplace investigation carried out in the public sector will often (eventually) become an official document, which means that the document can be requested by the public. There are, however, provisions on secrecy that may restrict the right to gain access to official documents. These provisions are found in the Public Access to Information and Secrecy Act (2009:400).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

However, in combination with the right to be heard and the right to be informed regarding an investigation,

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The practice of stipulating matters to ensure adherence to confidentiality is not uncommon. As such, NDAs are executed as a means of added protection for both the company and the employees involved.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

NDAs can be used for some investigations carried out in the private sector. However, under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, a contract is void to the extent it retracts or restricts a person's rights under the

Swedish Whistleblowing Act. An NDA that restricts the right to report irregularities to authorities or the media would, therefore, typically be void.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

In addition to the above-mentioned statutory confidentiality obligations, separate non-disclosure agreements can be signed. In an internal investigation, the employee should be expressly instructed to maintain confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The employer's internal policy can indicate that investigation materials must be kept confidential.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Attorney-client privilege will apply to all communication and investigative material between a client and its law firm. Attorney-client privilege is, however, not without limitations. Regarding investigations into alleged employee misconduct, a law firm may have to report suspected money laundering to the authorities and under certain circumstances disclose information to the financial police.

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.

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since the fact-finding phase of the investigation is considered to be a preliminary step before the commencement of the administrative disciplinary process, an employee's right to representation does not attach.

However, when the administrative disciplinary process commences, the employee has the right to have legal representation during the investigation. While no law requires the employee to have counsel present during the investigation, the employee has the right, if he or she chooses, to be advised by counsel or have legal representation.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employee has no right to bring legal representation. However, the outcome of an investigation may lead to employment-related consequences, so it may be appropriate (depending on the situation) to offer the employee the opportunity to bring a union representative (if the employee is unionised) or a legal representative.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Except if provided expressly under a collective bargaining agreement, the union does not have the right to be involved in the investigation. Given that the investigation is between the employee and the company, it follows that the union does not have any right to participate in the investigation proceedings.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

No, but if the employee under investigation is unionised it is appropriate to inform the union about the investigation. If the employer chooses to take action against the employee during, or after, the investigation, the trade union generally needs to be consulted before any final decisions are made.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the employer is not authorised to inform a works council or trade union about the investigation, as it may be in violation of the duty of confidentiality (see question 10).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since the conduct of an investigation is different from the administrative disciplinary process, management is given wide latitude for the exercise of the same.

After the employer determines that there are sufficient grounds to support the conduct of a formal administrative process, employees that are the subject of an administrative hearing should be allowed to present evidence to support his or her statements. Further, the employee may also provide affidavits of his or her co-employees consistent with his or her testimony.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employer is responsible for the work environment and must ensure that employees are not at risk of mental (or physical) illness due to an investigation. If an employee, in connection with an investigation, requires support or if risk of ill health is otherwise anticipated, the employer is obliged to assess the situation and provide said employee with sufficient support (eg, counselling or work adjustments).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

If unrelated matters are revealed because of a workplace investigation, the employer may look into the new matter and then determine whether there are sufficient grounds to proceed with an administrative disciplinary process for the new matter.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

According to the GDPR, personal data can only be processed for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and may not be further processed in a manner that is incompatible with those purposes. This imposes restrictions on the use of material from previous investigations in new investigations when the material was collected for other purposes. It is, therefore, necessary to ensure whether the new matter relates to the investigation and falls within the purpose of the investigation. If the new matter is unrelated to the investigation and does not fall within the purpose of the investigation, the identified information may not be processed under the GDPR.

Except for what is stated above, no regulation limits how the employer can use information regarding unrelated matters. Unrelated matters may be a myriad of different things, and could in some instances just be discarded, while in other situations the information may invoke a responsibility to act for the employer (eg, if the unrelated matters concern work environment issues or other severe misconduct by an employee who is not the target of the investigation). Furthermore, the employer may always use any revealed information (unrelated or not) as evidence in a court of law, since the principle of free examination of evidence applies.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

There are no regulations in this regard in the Swiss employment law framework. However, in criminal proceedings, the rules regarding accidental findings apply (eg, article 243, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for searches and examinations or article 278, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for surveillance of post and telecommunications). In principle, accidental findings are usable, with the caveat of general prohibitions on the use of evidence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

19. What if the employee under investigation raises a grievance during the investigation?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

matter disclosed is being or will be investigated.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

If an employee under investigation raises a grievance during an ongoing investigation, the employer must ensure that the employee under investigation is treated reasonably and fairly. Thus, the employer must also give attention to the complaint made by the employee and determine if there are reasonable grounds for the concern of the employee. If the employer determines the validity of the grievance raised, the employer may conduct a separate investigation for it.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

There are no formal rules or processes for handling grievances in Sweden. Depending on the nature of the grievance, such a complaint may also have to be investigated (unless the grievance is deemed to be trivial). This could, for example, be the case if the grievance concerns new or other work environment issues that the employer is obliged to investigate.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since neither consent nor the presence of the employee is material to the conduct of the investigation, his or her absence would not, in practice, imperil the conduct of the investigation.

As previously discussed, because the employer exercises a wide latitude of discretion in conducting workplace investigations, the employer may choose to proceed with the investigation despite the absence of the employee being investigated. Since the proceeding is only in the investigation phase, the statutory right of the employee to be heard is not violated, even if the investigation takes place without his or her participation.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

The employer is responsible for the employee's work environment during the investigation. The employer must assess the situation and the impact on the employee's health and may, depending on the situation, have to postpone certain investigative measures, such as interviewing the employee in question. The investigation may even have to be completed without the employee participating.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

It is within the employer's discretion to pursue the investigation even if a parallel criminal or regulatory investigation is taking place. As such, different investigations may proceed independently of each other. However, if the workplace investigation would interfere with or hinder the criminal or regulatory investigation, the workplace investigation should defer to the investigation being conducted by the people in authority. Since the nature of a workplace investigation is highly confidential, the police or regulations cannot compel any evidence from the employer without a court order.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Handling a parallel investigation will have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis depending on the applicable rules. For instance, an investigation under the Swedish Discrimination Act is subject to certain timing requirements with which the employer must comply. In other cases, it may be more appropriate to hold off the workplace investigation while awaiting the outcome of the parallel investigation.

The police or regulator can, depending on the matter at hand, request an employer to share evidence. The

police or the regulator may also, under certain circumstances, retain evidence in a search.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The employee under investigation should be informed of the results of the investigation and the basis of the conclusion. It should be included in the first notice or the notice to explain.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

This depends on the outcome of the investigation and the applicable rules.

If the outcome of the investigation leads to termination, the employer will have to disclose some information regarding the reason for termination. If the employee questions the termination, the employer

may have to disclose more information in a subsequent dispute. If the outcome of the investigation leads to less invasive measures, such as a warning, there are less extensive requirements to provide information.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the duty of confidentiality and the restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data must be considered (see question 10). If the investigation is based on the rules in the Swedish Discrimination Act, there are also feedback requirements concerning the involved parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

Workplace investigations often result in an investigation report that is intended to serve as the basis for any measures to be taken by the company's decisionmakers.

The employee's right to information based on article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection also covers the investigation report, provided that the report and the data contained therein relate to the employee.^[1] In principle, the employee concerned is entitled to receive a written copy of the entire investigation report free of charge (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 et seq, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection). Redactions may be made where the interests of the company or third parties so require, but they are the exception and must be kept to a minimum.^[2]

^[1] Arbeitsgericht Zürich, Entscheide 2013 No. 16; Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 393 et seq.

^[2] Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 394.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The employer is not compelled to share its investigation report with the employee. However, it would be ideal for the company to keep in its records a comprehensive report that details the findings of the investigation. This would be useful during the administrative disciplinary process when the employee requests to be informed of the substantive grounds for his or her eventual termination.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

There is no obligation to share the investigation report, neither in full nor key findings, with the involved parties. An assessment needs to be made in each case of what is appropriate to share and with whom.

When sharing an investigation report, certain data protection considerations must be made. A purpose and legal basis for the sharing must be established and, in principle, documented.

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the duty of confidentiality and the restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data must be considered (see question 10).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise based on data protection law vis-à-vis the persons concerned (eg, the accused). Likewise, there is no obligation to disclose other documents, such as the records of interviews. The employee should be fully informed of the final investigation report, if necessary, with certain redactions (see question 22). The right of the employee concerned to information is comprehensive (ie, all investigation files must be disclosed to him).^[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.^[2]

^[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, in: *HR Today*, to be found on: <Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten | hrtoday.ch> (last visited on 27 June 2022).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

After the investigation has been concluded, the next steps of the employer will depend on the result of the investigation. If there are reasonable grounds to hold the employee for an administrative hearing, the employer may issue a Notice To Explain containing the charges against him or her and allowing the employee to explain his or her side. Otherwise, the employer may terminate the investigation immediately.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

An investigation may result in employment law measures (eg, support, training, relocation, warning, termination or dismissal). An investigation may also be inconclusive and not result in any action.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

If the investigation uncovers misconduct, the question arises as to what steps should be taken. Of course, the severity of the misconduct and the damage caused play a significant role. Furthermore, it must be noted that the cooperation of the employee concerned may be of decisive importance for the outcome of the investigation. The possibilities are numerous, ranging, for example, from preventive measures to criminal complaints.^[1]

If individual disciplinary actions are necessary, these may range from warnings to ordinary or immediate termination of employment.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

25. Who can (or must) the investigation findings be disclosed to? Does that include regulators/police? Can the interview records be kept private, or are they at risk of disclosure?

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The result of the workplace investigation must be kept private by the employer. These are confidential matters that should not be disclosed to people or entities who did not take part in the investigation. However, if the investigation findings show that a possibly unlawful or criminal activity has taken place, or is about to take place, the employer should share such findings with the authorities.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Findings may have to be handed over to the police or the regulator – there is no separate legal protection for material in employer investigations related to authorities. If the investigation has been carried out by a law firm, see question 14 on attorney-client privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

The outcome of the investigation should only remain on the employee's record for as long as is necessary, but shall not be less than three years as this is the record-keeping requirement under the Philippine Labor Code. If circumstances deem that such a report ceases to have any purpose whatsoever, it should be struck out of the employee's record.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Under the GDPR personal data may not, according to the general principle on storage limitation, be retained for longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the personal data are processed. The GDPR does not stipulate a generally applicable storage limitation period. Such a regulation is, on the other hand,

included in the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act applies, the outcome of the investigation and all personal data should be retained for as long as necessary, but not for longer than two years after the investigation has been closed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*
at Bloomfield LP

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*
at Villaraza & Angangco

An employer may be liable for illegal termination if a dismissal is made based on wrong information collected during the investigation. Thus, the data and information gathered during the investigation stage

must be correct and accurate. Further, investigations should be conducted in a manner that is fair and reasonable to the employee under investigation. Otherwise, the employee may treat the investigation as harassment on the part of the employer, which may subject the employer to a potential lawsuit.

Last updated on 26/01/2023



Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*
at Mannheimer Swartling

Errors resulting in terminations can be unlawful and, if they lead to employees terminating their employment as a result of the employer's missteps, could be seen as constructive dismissal. Constructive dismissal is generally equivalent to an unlawful dismissal. Unlawful terminations generally result in an obligation to pay financial and general damages to the affected employees.

Failure to fulfil the obligations under the Swedish Discrimination Act may lead to an obligation to pay financial and general damages.

If an employer does not fulfil its obligations according to work environment legislation, there is a risk that the Swedish Work Environment Authority will issue injunctions or prohibitions against the employer. If an employer omits to meet its work environment related obligations, and that in turn results in a work related accident, e.g. self-harm in connection with an internal investigation, it may also, in a worst case scenario, lead to criminal liability.

The Swedish Work Environment Authority is also responsible for monitoring compliance with the provisions of the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. The Swedish Work Environment Authority may, if necessary to ensure compliance with the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, order an operator to comply with the obligations and requirements of the Swedish Whistleblowing Act. Employers violating the Swedish Whistleblowing Act may also be liable to pay damages to the affected employees.

If personal data is processed in a way that violates the GDPR, the authorised supervisory authority may issue warnings or reprimands to the data controller, order the controller to comply with the GDPR, impose a ban on processing, or impose an administrative fine on the controller. Companies violating the GDPR may also be liable to pay damages to data subjects.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Evidence obtained unlawfully may only be used in civil proceedings if there is an overriding interest in establishing the truth (article 152 paragraph 2, Swiss Civil Procedure Code). Consequently, in each case, a

balance must be struck between the individual's interest in not using the evidence and in establishing the truth.^[2] The question of the admissibility of evidence based on an unlawful invasion of privacy is a sensitive one – admissibility in this case is likely to be accepted only with restraint.^[3] Since the parties in civil proceedings do not have any means of coercion at their disposal, it is not necessary, in contrast to criminal proceedings, to examine whether the evidence could also have been obtained by legal means.^[4]

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

^[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

^[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Nigeria

Adekunle Obebe
Bloomfield LP



Philippines

Rashel Ann C. Pomoy
Villaraza & Angangco



Sweden

Henric Diefke
Tobias Normann
Alexandra Baron
Mannheimer Swartling





Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com