

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?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

There is no codified law in India on conducting workplace investigations, so they largely depend on the internal policies of the employer. Certain requirements and best practice measures have evolved through judicial precedent, and these are codified through internal policies.

For claims involving sexual harassment, however, investigations can only be undertaken by the Internal Committee (IC), which an employer needs to constitute under the Prevention of Sexual Harassment of Women and Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act 2013 (SH Act).

The general principle laid down by the courts is that any action against an employee for misconduct should be taken after conducting a disciplinary inquiry as per the principles of natural justice (PNJ). Whether or not a disciplinary inquiry can be done away with in any circumstances is a very fact-specific assessment and depends on various factors, including but not limited to the seniority and location of employment of the employee, and the nature and circumstances of the alleged misconduct.

The PNJ broadly require:

- that the accused employee should be issued with a written charge sheet or notice setting out the allegations against him or her along with a reasonable opportunity to respond;
- appointment of an independent inquiry officer to assess whether the allegations are proven or not; and
- that action must be taken based on the outcome of the inquiry, any punishment ordered should be proportionate to the gravity of the misconduct, and also take into account the service history (eg, prior warnings) of the individual.

The charge sheet or notice issued to the employee has to set out the evidence used by the employer to support the allegations in sufficient detail. Therefore, gathering necessary information and evidence is usually a critical precursor for any disciplinary process that an employer may eventually initiate against an employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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.

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

As a precursor to the actual disciplinary process, investigations are usually initiated when the employer becomes aware of an allegation or complaint of misconduct, or observes any acts or omissions by an employee constituting workplace misconduct. The employer (or investigating committee – which could also be an outside agency like an auditor or law firm appointed by the employer) would generally commence the investigation by speaking with the complainant (or whistleblower) to gather as many details as possible (relevant facts, evidence, list of witnesses, etc) concerning the allegations, so that the next steps and approach can be determined upfront.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

Internal investigations are usually initiated after reports about possible violations of the employer's code of conduct, applicable laws or regulations have been submitted by employees to their superiors, the human

resources department or designated internal reporting systems such as hotlines (including whistleblowing hotlines).

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Yes, an employee can be suspended or placed on administrative leave during an investigation if the circumstances warrant it. It is recommended to include the right to suspend in employee-facing policies. The employee should be informed about the suspension in writing, by issuing a suspension letter. In practice, a suspension is used when the charges against the employee are serious or if the employee's presence at the workplace is likely to prejudice the investigation in any manner (eg, where there are concerns that evidence may be tampered with or witnesses pressurised). The requirement to suspend the

employee should be assessed on a case-by-case basis and should not be exercised in every instance. If an employee is suspended, the investigation and inquiry should be completed as quickly as possible.

Further, concerning payment during the period of suspension, the law varies depending on the state and the category of employee. Generally, Indian law requires that individuals who are “workmen” be paid a subsistence allowance during the period of suspension, usually at the rate of 50% of their regular wages during the first 90 days of the suspension, and at varying rates thereafter. The exact rates at which subsistence allowance is paid will vary from state to state. In our experience, many companies choose to suspend employees with full salary even if there is an applicable subsistence allowance statute. This helps take some pressure off of the timeline within which the investigation and subsequent disciplinary inquiry can be completed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Complaints pertaining to sexual harassment can only be investigated by the IC constituted under the SH

Act.

For other kinds of misconduct, employers usually constitute a fact-finding investigation team with members who are independent and unbiased. The fact-finding team can be appointed internally, or the employer could also engage an external agency, depending upon the gravity and sensitivity of the matter, the nature of the issues being investigated or a desire to try and maintain legal privilege regarding the findings of the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

There is no compulsory requirement or qualification arising from the law as to the selection of the investigation team. The number and the profile of the investigation team need to be decided according to the characteristics of the case, whereas the head of the investigation team needs to be a competent and experienced investigator. A conflict of interest review is required to be conducted for the whole

investigation team to protect the interests of the company. As conflicts of interest can also arise during an investigation process, relying on the support of an outside legal team should be considered, particularly for internal investigations that are likely to expand.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

An employee has very limited ability to bring legal action to stop the investigation, as no disciplinary measure is taken against an individual during the investigation stage. The risk of claims or disputes generally arises after the employer has taken disciplinary measures against the individual.

An employee could, however, bring claims in some circumstances – for example, if the individual has been suspended without pay, or if the individual's assets have been seized as part of the investigation without following due process. Therefore, it is critical that robust internal guidelines are framed that lay out the framework to follow in investigations to mitigate the risk of legal claims or disputes.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Yes, in matters pertaining to sexual harassment, the SH Act expressly stipulates that the IC holds the powers of a civil court to summon any person to be examined as a witness. In misconduct cases, the investigating authority can ask employees to appear and testify before it as witnesses and internal policies should have provisions for this. As a result, employees are duty-bound to fairly and honestly participate in any investigative or disciplinary proceedings relating to the workplace, including offering truthful evidence and testimony on matters they may have observed or experienced as an employee of the organisation. While employees don't have any express statutory protections when acting as witnesses, any such policy should be balanced and include necessary safeguards, such as assuring employees that any retaliation against them will not be tolerated and that the details of their participation will only be shared on a need-to-know basis.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

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

knows of may reasonably be deemed to be a lawful and reasonable directive from an employer.

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

07. What data protection or other regulations apply

when gathering physical evidence?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

In India, the collection, disclosure, transfer and storage of personal data is regulated by the Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011 (SPD Rules). Accordingly, if during an investigation any sensitive personal information (such as information relating to passwords; financial information such as a bank account, credit or debit card or other payment instrument details; a physical, physiological or mental health condition; sexual orientation; medical history; and biometric information) is collected, then the requirements under the SPD Rules will need to be complied with. This would include obtaining an individual's "informed consent" before collecting any sensitive personal data if such information is intended to be collected or stored in an electronic format.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

It can be derived from the duty to [disclose and hand over benefits received and work produced](#) (article 321b, Swiss Code of Obligations) as they belong to the employer.^[2] The employer is, therefore, generally entitled to collect and process data connected with the end product of any work completely by an employee and associated with their business. However, it is prohibited by the Swiss Criminal Code to open a sealed document or consignment to gain knowledge of its contents without being authorised to do so (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code). Anyone who disseminates or makes use of information of which

he or she has obtained knowledge by opening a sealed document or mailing not intended for him or her may become criminally liable (article 179 paragraph 1, Swiss Criminal Code).

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

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

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

- it should be the most convenient and efficient method to identify any employee wrongdoing to protect the legitimate interests of the company; and

- the data processing should not harm the fundamental rights and freedoms of the employees.

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Yes, an employer can search its employees' official possessions and files as part of an investigation. It may be difficult, however, to seize personal assets or possessions of an employee (such as the individual's mobile phone or personal laptop).

Employers should expressly create policies that address key issues associated with employee surveillance, forensic searches and investigations, such as:

- whether or not the official assets and infrastructure of the company can be used for personal purposes by employees;
- the organisation's right to monitor, surveil or search any authorised or unauthorised use of its corporate assets; and
- that the employee should not have any expectation of privacy when using the companies' resources, etc.

Any forensic review of digital data must be carried out with due regard to Indian rules of evidence to avoid situations where such evidence becomes unreliable in a future legal claim or dispute.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Indian labour legislation does not stipulate any additional considerations or requirements concerning whistleblower complaints in private organisations and these are only available if there are complaints against public servants. Further, under the Companies Act, 2013, certain companies are required to establish a "vigil mechanism" for directors and employees to report genuine concerns regarding the affairs of the company. The vigil mechanism should provide adequate safeguards against the victimisation of persons using it.



Singapore

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an

investigation?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Indian labour statutes do not contain any specific confidentiality obligations concerning investigations. However, in practice, the records of investigative or disciplinary proceedings should be kept confidential and shared only on a need-to-know basis to ensure that the parties do not suffer prejudice. The internal policies should also include provisions on confidentiality.

The SH Act, however, provides that certain information must not be published or made known to the public, press and media such as:

- the contents of the SH complaint;
- the identity and addresses of the complainant, accused and witnesses;
- any information on the conciliation and inquiry process;
- the recommendations of the IC; and
- action to be taken by the employer.

The SH Act permits the dissemination of information regarding remedies extended to any victim without disclosing the name, address or identity of the victim or witnesses. The SH Act also outlines punishments for violating confidentiality obligations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

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

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.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

As mentioned earlier, workplace investigations are normally a precursor to the actual disciplinary process against an employee. If the individual is being suspended during the investigation, the employer is only

expected to inform the individual that they are being suspended on account of an ongoing investigation along with the broad nature of allegations or concerns, and does not need to disclose specific details about the allegations until the appropriate time. Further details may be provided at the investigation stage itself when the employee may be interviewed, or at the subsequent disciplinary inquiry.

Where a disciplinary process is necessary and initiated (after the investigation), the employee will have to be given a charge sheet or notice setting out the allegations against the individual in detail and be provided with an opportunity to submit an explanation.

In sexual harassment investigations, the SH Act mandatorily requires the IC to submit a copy of the complaint to the accused. Further, the accused should be informed of the requirement to file his or her reply to the complaint along with a list of supporting documents, evidence, names and addresses of witnesses, etc, and the timelines for submitting his response in defence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Also, rights to information arise from the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. In principle, the right to information (article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) is linked to a corresponding request for information by the concerned person and the existence of data collection within the meaning of article 3 (lit. g), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection. Insofar as the documents from the internal investigation recognisably relate to a specific person, there is in principle a right to information concerning these documents. Subject to certain conditions, the right to information may be denied, restricted or postponed by law (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). For example, such documents and reports may also affect the confidentiality and protection interests of third parties, such as other employees. Based on the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employer is required to protect them by taking appropriate measures (eg, by making appropriate redactions before

handing out copies of the respective documents (article 9 paragraph 1 (lit. b), Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection)).^[4] Furthermore, the employer may refuse, restrict or defer the provision of information where the company's interests override the employee's, and not disclose personal data to third parties (article 9 paragraph 4, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). The right to information is also not subject to the statute of limitations, and individuals may waive their right to information in advance (article 8 paragraph 6, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection). If there are corresponding requests, the employer must generally grant access, or provide a substantiated decision on the restriction of the right of access, within 30 days (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 paragraph 4, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection).

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

The response and approach to this would be very fact-specific.

Under the SH Act, an individual cannot file an anonymous complaint and, therefore, the name of the complainant cannot be kept confidential. The same would go for details of witnesses, if any.

For other types of misconduct, the name of the complainant could potentially be kept confidential, depending on the nature of the allegations. For example, if an individual observes another colleague or employee committing inappropriate conduct (such as fraud or bribery) and reports this, the name of the complainant may not necessarily have to be disclosed to the accused employee, especially where the company is independently able to gather evidence substantiating the allegations. The names of witnesses generally cannot be kept confidential, since doing so may prove prejudicial to the accused employee. Further, as part of the disciplinary inquiry process, the accused has the right to cross-examine witnesses.

Notwithstanding the above, the approach to this issue should be assessed on a case-by-case basis by looking at the underlying sensitivities and risks involved. Courts have, in limited circumstances, permitted non-disclosure of the names of witnesses or complainants.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Yes. While it is common for employees to be bound by general confidentiality obligations at the beginning of employment, it is advisable to reiterate such confidentiality obligations through NDAs during an investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Professional advice given by an "advocate" to a client is protected as "privileged communication" and is not admissible as evidence in a court of law. Such privilege may not attach to advice or communications involving in-house lawyers as they are not licensed advocates (since they are expected to surrender their bar licences when they take on in-house roles). This is a grey area as there are conflicting judicial precedents on this. Hence, communications, documents or information gathered during an investigation conducted entirely internally may not be legally privileged and may be discoverable in a dispute. That said, companies generally mark sensitive communications with in-house attorneys as privileged and confidential in an attempt to protect the same.

For the above reasons, investigations conducted by external advocates have better chances of retaining legal privilege. However, the following will not be treated as privileged information:

- any correspondence about the commission of a crime or fraud by the client; and
- the observations of an attorney that would suggest that a crime or fraud will be committed by the client.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

Legal advice privilege may attach to investigation materials if the materials were created to seek or obtain legal advice; or if the materials contain legal advice that is so embedded or has become such an integral

part of the materials that the legal advice cannot be redacted from them. If the legal advice is separable from the materials, then only the parts of the materials containing legal advice will be protected by privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

In SH cases, parties are not allowed to bring in a legal practitioner to represent them in the IC's proceedings.

In investigations related to other forms of misconduct, there isn't a statutory right to be accompanied by another employee, colleague or lawyer during a fact-finding investigation. In a disciplinary inquiry, if the employee seeks permission to be represented by another person, such as an advocate, co-worker or a union leader, the inquiry officer must decide whether to allow the request based on the specific facts and circumstances as well as any company policies on the subject. If the management has appointed a lawyer to present the company's case in disciplinary proceedings or if the matter is complex and involves legal aspects, courts have held that the employee would also have a right to legal representation.

Further, in general misconduct matters, "workman" employees would generally have the right to be represented by a co-worker in inquiry proceedings, if the establishment is covered under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 (SO Act). The applicability of this statute depends on the nature of the establishment and its headcount.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

However, if there are conflicting interests between the company and the employee involved, when the employee is accused of any misconduct, the employee must be able to be accompanied by their own legal representative. For example, if the employee's conduct might potentially constitute a criminal offence, the involvement of a legal representative must be permitted.^[2] Failure to allow an accused person to be accompanied by a legal representative during an internal investigation, even though the facts in question are relevant to criminal law, raises the question of the admissibility of statements made in a subsequent

criminal proceeding. The principles of the Swiss Criminal Procedure Code cannot be undermined by alternatively collecting evidence in civil proceedings and thus circumventing the stricter rules applicable in criminal proceedings.[3]

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

No.

There is no specific requirement to constitute a works council for most industries or inform the trade union about an investigation or disciplinary inquiry.

It is common, however, for individuals to share details of the matter with trade union representatives and seek their support. Further, if an employee has the right to be represented or supported by a colleague (for example, if the establishment is covered by the SO Act), the individual may request trade union representatives to support them during inquiry proceedings.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Every workplace investigation is unique and varies based on the facts and circumstances of each case. As a result, the nature or type of support to be given to an employee would also vary from case to case. The bare minimum should be an assurance that there will be no retaliation against them for participating in the investigation. Other measures may include:

- changing the reporting relationship if the accused is the reporting manager or boss of the complainant;
- conducting investigations and interviews virtually or through videoconferencing in cases where parties or witnesses may not be able to physically appear before the investigating authorities; and
- allowing witnesses to be cross-examined virtually or through a written questionnaire where there is a fear of intimidation or retaliation from the parties.

The employer should be mindful that any interim measures or support it extends does not prejudice any particular party.

Under the SH Act, employers are legally required to assist the complainant if he or she chooses to file a complaint about workplace sexual harassment with the police under the Indian Penal Code or any other law that is in force. Further, the complainant can also seek interim protective measures from the IC, such as a request for transfer for the accused or the complainant or to grant leave to the complainant for three months.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

Employers may provide support, such as:

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Where unrelated matters are revealed during, or because of, the investigation, the course to be adopted may depend on several factors. Normally, if additional instances of misconduct are revealed against the same accused employee, even if they are unrelated to the original investigation, it would be advisable to independently investigate those issues too, to ensure that there are comprehensive grounds for any future disciplinary inquiry or action. If unrelated matters are revealed against other stakeholders involved in the investigation – for example, a forensic review reveals that the complainant or some witnesses have themselves potentially engaged in some other form of policy breach – whether or not those issues are investigated (as well as the timing of such investigation) would need to be decided on a case-by-case basis. Issues to consider include whether these matters affect the credibility of their statements, point at some form of other conspiracy, or create the risk of retaliation claims at a later date.

In SH matters, however, if the complaint involves instances of sexual harassment as well as other forms of general harassment or misconduct, to the extent such other issues aren't linked to the instances of sexual harassment (eg, creation of a hostile work environment for the complainant), these other concerns should preferably not be investigated by the IC and instead should be referred to the employer to address, as per its general grievance-redressal mechanisms.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Indian labour statutes do not prescribe any particular process to be followed if the accused raises any grievances during the investigation and such situations would need to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. For example, if the grievances relate to the fairness of the investigation or inquiry process, the lack of impartiality of the investigators or the inquiry officer, those may need to be addressed upfront before proceeding further. Where grievances may be unrelated to the investigation or inquiry at hand (and potentially also a method to distract the employer from the core issues or delay or confuse the main investigative proceedings), it may be advisable to communicate to the employee that such grievances will

have to be dealt with separately and other safeguards adopted to avoid calling the main investigation or inquiry proceedings into question (eg identifying an independent team to review the grievances).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

If, during the investigation, the employee under investigation raises a grievance, the investigator will be expected to temporarily stop the investigation to assess the situation. The investigation team will evaluate whether the employee is raising a grievance as a defence mechanism or in good faith and with sincere concerns. If the subject of the grievance is related to the pending investigation, the investigation may be extended to cover this new item. Otherwise, a new investigation can be initiated by the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

The approach to be adopted would be fact-specific but the investigation itself can normally continue, even in the absence of the accused employee. Where it is critical to speak with the employee as part of the investigative process, delays on account of the employee's sickness may need to be accommodated. At the same time, the employer would normally be justified in seeking necessary evidence of the authenticity of the employee's illness and anticipated duration of absence. An accused individual's participation would be more crucial in a disciplinary inquiry to formally respond to the written charges or present their side before the inquiry officer, and absences due to genuine health concerns may need to be reasonably accommodated. Significantly long periods of absence for health reasons may itself be valid grounds to terminate employment under Indian law, subject to the terms and conditions of employment.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

The duration of the blocking period depends on the employee's seniority, amounting to 30 days in the employee's first year of service, 90 days in the employee's second to ninth year of service and 180 days

thereafter (article 336c paragraph 1 (lit. c), Swiss Code of Obligations).

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Often the tests or standards applied by external agencies (such as the police or regulators) in their investigations vary significantly in comparison to those that apply for internal investigations that are focused on potential disciplinary action against an accused employee. For example, the standard of proof required for taking an internal disciplinary measure is one of a preponderance of probability and does not require the employer to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, which is the standard applied in criminal proceedings. Depending on the circumstances, conducting or continuing an internal investigation can also place the organisation in a better position to collaborate with external agencies such as the police or a regulator in their investigations, and be better prepared to share information that such agencies may request. It may also help demonstrate that the organisation does not tolerate potential violations of law or its policies and that it proactively investigates and addresses such issues. This may also help in protecting innocent members of management from liability from external agencies. To that extent, a parallel criminal or regulatory investigation may not normally be a reason for the organisation to suspend its internal investigation.

In the context of sexual harassment claims, the complainant has the right to file a police complaint against the alleged harasser (and the organisation must support her in doing so). However, a parallel police investigation would not take away the organisation's responsibility to address the grievances through its IC, which would be expected to complete its proceedings within 90 days.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

22. What must the employee under investigation be

told about the outcome of an investigation?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Concerning SH cases, the IC must supply a copy of the preliminary findings to the complainant and accused (where both are employees of the organisation) to allow them to make their representations before final findings and recommendations are shared. The IC's final report with recommendations for disciplinary action, if any, must also be shared with both parties.

For other forms of misconduct, it is not mandatory to share the details of the fact-finding investigation itself. However, if disciplinary action is contemplated and a disciplinary inquiry is necessary against the employee under investigation, the relevant details of the evidence gathered against the individual will need to be shared with him or her as part of the charge sheet. On the other hand, where no disciplinary inquiry is being conducted after an investigation (eg, if there is no merit in the allegations), the employer may choose to not share the investigative findings and only inform the individual that no further action is being taken.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Please see question 22.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise based on data protection law vis-à-vis the persons concerned (eg, the accused). Likewise, there is no obligation to disclose other documents, such as the records of interviews. The employee should be fully

informed of the final investigation report, if necessary, with certain redactions (see question 22). The right of the employee concerned to information is comprehensive (ie, all investigation files must be disclosed to him).[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.[2]

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

In misconduct cases, the next steps for an employer would depend on the outcome of the investigation. If the investigation reveals that the employee has violated the terms of employment and the employer wishes to take disciplinary action (which may include dismissal, depending on the gravity of the misconduct), it would normally be necessary to conduct a disciplinary inquiry as per the principles of natural justice before any actual punishment is meted out. Such a disciplinary inquiry would normally require the issuance of a charge sheet, the appointment of an independent inquiry officer (who should not have been involved in the investigation or otherwise in a position of bias vis-a-vis the parties involved), and conducting disciplinary hearings, etc.

With SH complaints, once the investigation is concluded by the IC, the employer will be provided with a copy of the final report by the IC along with recommendations (ie, the disciplinary measures to be taken against the accused) for the employer to implement. The employer would then be required to act upon the recommendations shared by the IC within 60 days.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Turkey

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

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

- may provide the employee with a written warning requesting him or her not to repeat the same conduct;
- terminate the employment relationship based on either just cause, without paying any compensation immediately, or valid reason by observing statutory notice periods or making payment in lieu of notice and paying severance compensation if applicable; or
- not take any action if the investigation concludes that no fault is attributable to the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

25. Who can (or must) the investigation findings be disclosed to? Does that include regulators/police? Can

the interview records be kept private, or are they at risk of disclosure?



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

Please see question 22.

For SH complaints, the report would normally contain a complete record of interviews conducted, evidence provided and other associated artefacts.

While investigation reports for other forms of misconduct may be kept private (subject to observations in the prior response relating to disciplinary inquiries), whether or not the investigative report should be disclosed to external agencies such as the police or other regulators would be a subjective decision. Disclosure may be necessary where a demand is made by the external agency as per powers it enjoys under the law (to seek production of necessary documents or personnel Rules of legal privilege may also be important to assess if any information can be withheld based on client-attorney privilege.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

There is no statutory guidance on this. It is common for employers to retain details of disciplinary proceedings on an employee's record for the entire duration of their employment.

It is also advisable to retain the details of any investigations or disciplinary proceedings for at least three years after an individual has been dismissed on account of such proceedings, as this is the general limitation period for raising claims of unfair dismissal. In labour matters, courts in India often allow delays in filing suit after the limitation period, meaning organisations sometimes make a practical call to retain details of investigations and disciplinary proceedings for longer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

This depends on the company's internal disciplinary policy and the severity of the offence. For instance, a written warning issued against an employee for minor misconduct is usually kept in the respondent employee's file for one year and if the employee does not commit any further breaches during this time,

the written warning will be expunged. However, if there is a finding of serious misconduct, particularly if such a determination results in the dismissal of the employee, these records are generally kept in the employee's file for the duration of time such records are statutorily required to be maintained.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

The risk an employer may face would be quite subjective. For example, if an individual is suspended

without pay, the individual may attempt to argue that the entire investigation should be set aside, as non-payment of salary affects an individual's ability to properly represent themselves. Material errors in disciplinary proceedings or not adhering to the rules of natural justice may result in disciplinary action being set aside, and potentially also orders for reinstatement of the employee with back pay (if the individual is protected by local labour laws) if the dismissal is found to be unfair or disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct.

In addition to the above risks, in SH matters, if the IC constitution is incorrect or there are allegations of bias against a committee member, the whole investigation may be set aside and the organisation ordered to conduct a fresh inquiry through a properly constituted committee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Singapore

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

^[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

^[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Turkey

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



India

Atul Gupta
Kanishka Maggon
Kopal Kumar
Trilegal



Singapore

Jonathan Yuen

Doreen Chia

Tan Ting Ting

Rajah & Tann Singapore



Switzerland

Laura Widmer

Sandra Schaffner

Bär & Karrer



Turkey

Elvan Aziz

Gülce Saydam Pehlivan

Emre Kotil

Osman Pepeoğlu

Paksoy

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com