

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

Phil Linnard at Slaughter and May
Clare Fletcher at Slaughter and May

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the complainant made use of an internal whistleblowing procedure, confidentiality regarding the identity of a reporter is mandatory. Also, in other cases and for other involved persons (witnesses), it is recommended to keep their identity confidential to prevent the risk of intimidation or other negative consequences.

In complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, if the prevention adviser heard or took written statements from persons that were considered useful for the evaluation, these persons may remain anonymous.

The employee must, nevertheless, receive sufficient information to be able to offer a defence concerning the facts of which he or she is accused.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*
at Ogier

Failure by an employer to provide the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information seriously impinges upon the employee's right to fair procedure and could result in a flawed investigation.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Belgium

Nicolas Simon
Van Olmen & Wynant



Ireland

Bláthnaid Evans
Mary Gavin
Ogier



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer