

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?

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

In the UK, the primary employment legislation of relevance to a workplace investigation includes the Employment Rights Act 1996 (ERA 1996), the Equality Act 2010 (EA 2010), and the Employment Relations Act 1999 (ERA 1999).

Other legislation includes the retained EU law version of the General Data Protection Regulation (UK GDPR) and the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA 2018), the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (IPA 2016) and the Investigatory Powers (Interception by Businesses etc for Monitoring and Record-keeping Purposes) Regulations 2018 (IP Regs 2018), and the Humans Rights Act 1998 (HRA 1998).

In terms of guidance, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) have produced a [Code of Practice on Disciplinary and Grievance Procedures](#) (the ACAS Code) as well as a [Guide to conducting workplace investigations](#). The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) have their [Employment Practices Code](#), and other pieces of guidance on the data protection aspects of investigations (see question 7).

Most employers will have internal policies governing how workplace investigations should be conducted. The level of detail may vary considerably; public sector and regulated employers may be more prescriptive

in their policies, which may even have contractual force. There may also be provisions of the employment contract that are relevant (particularly as regards suspension – see question 3).

Last updated on 27/11/2023

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The trigger could come from several sources, such as a grievance from a current or former employee, a complaint from external sources, a whistleblowing disclosure, or as the result of internal governance measures.

In each case, the employer will need to decide if an investigation is warranted. It may be required by internal policies or regulatory requirements in some circumstances. Consideration must be given to whether an investigation is feasible; for example, is the evidence still in existence and accessible? Are key witnesses still employed or contactable?

If the employer concludes that an investigation is warranted, it should start without unreasonable delay. The first step would usually be to set terms of reference, which outline the purpose and remit of the investigation. These should be closely drafted and continually referred to, to avoid the investigation's scope expanding when new points arise (as they almost always will). An investigator will also need to be appointed (see question 4).

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)?



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

In the UK, suspension is not seen as a neutral act, so should not be a default approach at the start of an investigation. It may be appropriate if, for example, there is a risk to the health and safety of the employee in question (or any other employee), a risk that their continued presence in the business could prejudice the investigation, or risk of continued wrongdoing.

The employer should always check the individual's employment contract to see if it contains the power to suspend. Suspension should generally always be with pay to avoid any breach of contract. It should also be regularly reviewed and kept to a minimum duration.

Employers should not suspend employees under investigation as a knee-jerk reaction to bare allegations. There must be at least some evidence to support the need for suspension (which may require a preliminary investigation before deciding to suspend). Alternatives to suspension should always be considered, such as a temporary transfer to a different area of work, if the employee agrees or it is otherwise permitted by their contract.

If authorities such as regulators or prosecutorial agencies are involved in the investigation, they may have an opinion about an employee's suspension, particularly if they wish to conduct interviews. Consider whether or not to involve the authorities in the suspension discussions at an early stage.

ACAS have produced a [guide to suspension during investigations](#) (last updated Sept 2022) which gives further guidance on these issues.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

04. Who should conduct a workplace investigation,

are there minimum qualifications or criteria that need to be met?

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The investigator would typically be a line manager or HR representative. Complex cases, particularly if criminality is suspected, or cases where a senior employee is accused of misconduct, may require the investigator to be someone more senior within the organisation, or someone from the in-house legal team. Employers should bear in mind the need for someone more senior than the investigator to act as a disciplinary decisionmaker, if disciplinary action is found to be warranted.

Check the organisation's policies and procedures, which may stipulate who can act as an investigator.

The investigator should be someone without any personal involvement in the matters under investigation, or any conflict of interest, but with sufficient knowledge of the organisation and where possible with both training and experience in conducting investigations.

The business should consider how any prospective investigator may appear if they are called as a witness in court, or to give evidence before any governmental committee or regulatory panel. They should also consider whether the employee accused of wrongdoing should have any say in the choice of investigator; this would not typically occur, but having the employee's buy-in can increase the chances of a successful outcome to the investigation.

It is becoming increasingly common for businesses to use an external consultant or lawyer to conduct workplace investigations. This may be beneficial where it is not operationally viable within the employer organisation to have a different person conducting the investigation and the disciplinary hearing, or if the investigation is particularly sensitive or complex, or relates to a very senior employee. If an external investigator is appointed, the employer remains responsible for that investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

05. Can the employee under investigation bring legal

action to stop the investigation?



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Not usually, unless the investigation is being conducted in breach of a contractual policy (as sometimes happens in the NHS, for example), or if the investigation is not adjourned pending the outcome of criminal proceedings, and the employee can show that failure to do so is a breach of either an express term or the implied term of trust and confidence. The latter would be rare, but possible if the employee can demonstrate a real danger of a miscarriage of justice (see question 21).

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?



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Employees may be reluctant to be interviewed or act as witnesses as part of an investigation, perhaps due to fear of reprisals. The investigator should discuss any concerns with the employee and attempt to alleviate any fears.

In general terms, an employer should not compel any employee to provide a witness statement. There may be circumstances in which this could be seen as a reasonable management instruction (and any refusal to comply treated as a disciplinary matter), but these will be rare. Evidence that is compelled is unlikely to be particularly useful to the investigator.

It may be possible to establish an express or implied obligation for senior managers to report on another employee's misconduct – as a feature of either their employment contractual duties, their fiduciary duties or their implied duty of fidelity. However, it is unlikely, in the absence of an express obligation, that a junior employee would be compelled to give evidence against a colleague.

Employees who act as witnesses benefit from their usual employment protections, and must be treated as per their contractual and statutory rights, as well as any policy governing the investigation. If the investigation involves allegations which could involve discrimination, the EA 2010 extends protection from victimisation to “giving evidence or information in connection with proceedings under this Act”. Witnesses should therefore not be subject to any detrimental treatment because they have acted as a witness in this type of investigation. Witnesses may also be entitled to protection as whistleblowers if their evidence amounts to a protected disclosure (see question 9).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Most forms of workplace surveillance involve the processing of personal data that is regulated by the UK GDPR and DPA 2018. The UK GDPR requires that personal data must be processed lawfully, fairly and in a transparent manner; it also must be adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary concerning the purposes for which it is processed.

Employers should ensure that they have undertaken a data protection impact assessment (DPIA) to document the lawful basis for processing data, and informed employees that their files may be searched before proceeding. They should also ideally have a clear policy on the use of electronic communications systems, detailing when, how and for what purpose they may be monitored by the employer. In Q3 2023 the ICO produced new guidance on monitoring workers (<https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/employment/monitoring-workers/>) and on email and security (<https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/security/email-and-security/>) which employers should bear in mind during investigations. Employers should also be prepared to make the data collected through employee monitoring available to employees, should the employee submit a data subject access request under the DPA 2018.

The IPA 2016 makes it unlawful in certain circumstances to intercept a communication (such as one on an employer's telephone or computer network) in the course of its transmission in the UK. The IPA Regs 2018 set out the circumstances where, in a business context, such interception will be lawful. These include monitoring or recording communications without consent to: establish the existence of facts; ascertain compliance with the regulatory or self-regulatory practices or procedures relevant to the business; ascertain or demonstrate standards which are or ought to be achieved by persons using the system; and prevent or detect crime.

Covert surveillance can lead to a breach of an employee's right to privacy under the HRA 1998. The employer will need to consider if covert surveillance is proportionate, which will depend on the facts of each case. Employers should be careful not to use the investigation as an excuse to undertake a "fishing expedition", and should avoid gathering material that is obviously personal, such as private messages and diary entries (see question 8).

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

It may sometimes be difficult to draw a clear distinction between the property of the employer and employees' personal property, both physical and electronic, particularly where employees are increasingly working from home. Employers should ideally have a clear policy to delineate what is the employer's property.

Employees typically have a reasonable expectation of privacy at work, although how far this extends will depend on the circumstances of each case and the employer's policies.

When it comes to employees' personal possessions, a search should only be conducted in exceptional circumstances where there is a clear, legitimate justification. The employer should always consider whether it is possible to establish the relevant facts through the collection of other evidence. Even if the employee's contract specifies that it is permitted, employers would usually require explicit employee consent for the search to be lawful. The employee should be invited to be present during the search; if this is not feasible, another independent third party (such as a manager) should be present.

If the employee refuses to consent to a search of their personal possessions, their refusal should not be used to assume guilt; the investigator should explore why the employee has refused and seek to resolve their concerns if possible.

If the employer believes that a criminal offence has been committed it should consider involving the police, since they have wider powers to search individuals and their possessions.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The employer should first identify which individuals may have protection as whistleblowers. This could be a current or former employee who raises the initial complaint, a co-worker who gives evidence as part of the investigation, or the accused employee.

In each case, consider whether a “protected disclosure” has been made (under Part IVA ERA 1996). This requires analysis of the subject matter of the disclosure, how it is made, and a reasonable belief that it is made in the public interest.

Employers must then ensure there is no detrimental treatment or dismissal of any worker on the grounds of their protected disclosure. Although the causation test for these purposes is not straightforward, as a general rule if the protected disclosure has a “material influence” on the decision to discipline or dismiss, there may be liability. Individual managers may be personally liable alongside the employer. Compensation for whistleblowing cases is uncapped, meaning businesses and individuals can face significant financial and reputational exposure.

What this means in practical terms is that the employer should promote a “speak-up” culture and, where protected disclosures are made, ensure they are handled by a team who are properly trained in how to do so.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Workplace investigations should usually be conducted on a confidential basis, so that only those involved in the investigation are aware of its existence and subject matter. The need to maintain confidentiality about both the fact of the investigation, and any content discussed with an investigator, should be emphasised to all those involved. It may also be necessary to explain that a breach of confidentiality could be viewed as a disciplinary matter. Appropriate exceptions must, however, be made to allow employees to speak to any relevant employee or trade union representative, legal adviser and potentially the police or other regulators. Confidentiality provisions cannot override the rights of workers to make protected disclosures (see question 9).

In some situations, such as those involving a wide-ranging investigation into the organisation's working practices and culture, it may be more appropriate to investigate a more "open" basis, and inform employees and other stakeholders.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The employee must be able to effectively challenge the allegations against them. They should be given the terms of reference for the investigation, and any relevant documentary evidence, including copies of

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



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.



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Only in exceptional circumstances, such as where there is a genuine risk of retaliation. Anonymising a complaint puts the employee under investigation at a significant disadvantage, as they may be unable to properly challenge the evidence against them. It can also impair the effectiveness of the investigation. Employers should, therefore, not provide any guarantees of confidentiality to complainants or to employees who are to act as witnesses. That said, employers should think carefully about any necessary disclosure of names or facts. This can be particularly relevant where the witness is subordinate to the employee being investigated.

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



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Only to a limited extent. As a matter of law, NDAs cannot prevent a worker from making a protected disclosure, or reporting a crime to the police. As a matter of the regulatory obligations of solicitors, NDAs should not be used in other ways, including as a means of influencing the content of disclosures, or by using warranties, indemnities and clawback clauses in a way that is designed to, or has the effect of, improperly preventing or inhibiting permitted reporting or disclosures (see the [SRA's warning notice on the use of NDAs](#)).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

There are two limited types of privilege which may be relevant to investigations:

- Legal Advice Privilege (LAP), which protects communications between lawyers and their clients provided they are confidential and made for the dominant purpose of obtaining or giving legal advice; and
- Litigation Privilege (LP), which can extend to communications between a lawyer and client or third parties, but only where the dominant purpose of the communication is to prepare for or conduct existing or contemplated litigation.

If the relevant tests for privilege are met and apply to materials generated in the course of the investigation, the employer retains greater control over their subsequent disclosure to third parties. The materials would, for example, be protected against disclosure in any subject access request under the DPA 2018.

That said, privilege can be difficult to maintain in investigations, particularly where litigation is not active or in contemplation. Interview notes and witness statements may not attract privilege, particularly if these were conducted with employees who do not fall within the narrow definition of “the client” for LAP purposes (which is limited to employees who are capable of seeking and receiving advice on behalf of the employer).

If privilege applies to investigation materials, the investigator should keep tight control on what documents are created and how they are circulated, to avoid inadvertent disclosure and potential waiver of privilege.

Bear in mind that even if privilege applies to certain investigation materials, there may be a need to create disclosable documentation at a later stage, particularly if there is a decision to instigate disciplinary action.

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?



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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

There is no statutory right to be accompanied at a disciplinary investigation meeting; the right only applies to disciplinary hearings (section 10 ERA 1999). There is, however, a right to be accompanied by a colleague or trade union representative at any grievance investigation meeting, under section 10, although this is only in respect of the person who raises the grievance (not any person who is the subject of the grievance or other witnesses).

That said, the employer's policies and contracts should be checked to see if they contain a broader right to be accompanied. Employers may also need to allow a broader right to be accompanied as a reasonable adjustment for disabled employees (for example, to allow family members or medical professionals to be present). Equally, where the allegations are sufficiently serious (eg, criminal, especially if the findings are likely to be shared with the police), it may be appropriate to allow legal representation during the investigation.

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?

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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Aside from the statutory right to be accompanied (see question 15), any further involvement by the works council or trade union would depend on the terms of the relevant works council or trade union recognition agreement.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The employer needs to consider the health and wellbeing of all staff involved in the investigation, since this can be a very stressful process. The employer and investigator can assist by ensuring that all parties are aware of what is expected of them. Timings are also important; having a clear and expeditious timetable and providing updates if the timetable slips will help. Regular catch-ups by managers can be used to monitor how employees are coping. They should be reminded about any resources to help support them, such as employee helplines or employee assistance programmes.

Where an employer has particular concerns about an employee's health, a referral to occupational health can assist. The employer may also wish to consider whether employees should be given additional time off, or whether any other adjustments can be made to the investigation process. For particularly serious allegations, the employer may consider facilitating the provision of independent legal advice for the employee, or making a contribution towards legal fees.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

These should typically be disregarded by the investigator. From a data protection perspective, the ICO's position is that other information collected during an investigation should be disregarded and, where feasible, deleted unless it reveals information that no reasonable employer could be expected to ignore. In those circumstances, the employer should arrange for an independent third party to determine whether a separate investigation into unrelated matters is needed.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

This is a relatively common tactic. The employer will need to decide whether to suspend the investigation to deal with the grievance, or conclude the investigation first, depending on the circumstances. It would usually be difficult to deal with both the grievance and the investigation concurrently, unless the facts overlap significantly.

If the employee becomes uncooperative and refuses to take part in the investigation, they should be told that the investigator may need to make a decision in the absence of their account based on all the other evidence available. The employer may decide to treat it as failure to comply with a reasonable management instruction and take disciplinary action on that basis.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

This is a relatively common occurrence. It would usually be appropriate to suspend the investigation temporarily, to determine how serious the health issue is and when the employee may be fit to return. The investigator should consider what adjustments or allowances can be made to progress the investigation despite the employee's absence. If their evidence has not yet been gathered, the employee may be invited to provide a written statement instead of attending an investigation meeting, or the meeting could be held remotely or at a neutral location. If none of this is possible, it may be difficult to fully conclude the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

This situation needs to be handled with caution. It is important to remember that regulatory or criminal proceedings, and employment proceedings, are separate; while there may be an overlap of alleged misconduct, they are usually addressing different questions, with different standards of proof. The outcome in one should not, therefore, be treated as determinative of the other.

Where the employee is suspected of, charged with, or convicted of, a criminal or regulatory offence, the employer should still investigate the facts as far as possible, come to a view about them and consider

whether the conduct is sufficiently serious to warrant instituting the disciplinary procedure.

In terms of timing, there are no concrete rules governing how an employer must proceed in the circumstances of a parallel criminal investigation. Much will depend upon the circumstances of the case, the length of delay, the size of and resources available to the employer, and the preferences (if expressed) of the external authority. If the employer is concerned about prejudicing the regulatory or criminal proceedings or otherwise prefers to wait for their conclusion before instigating internal proceedings, they are unlikely to be criticised for delaying. The accused employee may also be advised not to provide a statement in the workplace investigation for fear of a negative impact on the criminal investigation. This would make it difficult to proceed with the workplace investigation, unless the employer is confident it has strong enough evidence to justify any disciplinary action subsequently taken.

On the other hand, regulatory or criminal investigations may take months or years to progress; it may not be realistic for the employer to keep any investigation in abeyance for so long. This is particularly true when the accused employee is suspended on full pay, witness recollections will grow less reliable, and the alleged victim may feel unable to return to work until the matter is resolved.

In these circumstances, the employer may continue with their investigation if they believe it is reasonable to do so, and consultations have commenced with the external agency. The court will usually only intervene if the employee can show that the continuation of the disciplinary proceedings will give rise to a real danger that there would be a miscarriage of justice in the criminal proceedings.

Employers should consider carefully whether and when to involve the police in allegations of employee misconduct. Employers must be careful not to subject their employees to the heavy burden of potential criminal proceedings without the most careful consideration, and a genuine and reasonable belief that the case, if established, might justify the epithet “criminal” being applied to the employee's conduct.

Where the police are called in, they should not be asked to conduct any investigation on behalf of the employer, nor should they be present at any meeting or disciplinary meeting. The employer should, however, communicate with the police to see if they have a strong view about whether the internal process should be stayed, or whether they should interview witnesses first.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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:

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The employee would usually get a copy of the investigation report (which would typically have the relevant evidence considered by the investigator annexed to the report, unless the report is privileged). It is not usual practice to allow the employee to make representations on the report before it is finalised.

The report will set out what facts the investigator was able to establish by reference to the available evidence. The investigator's role is to gather and consider evidence about what did or did not happen, so the employer can understand if there is a case to answer. This is distinct from determining culpability, which is something for the manager conducting the disciplinary hearing (not the investigator) to determine, in addition to deciding any disciplinary sanction.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The answer to this depends on whether or not privilege attaches to the report, as well as whether criminal proceedings are contemplated – if so, there may be a danger of waiver of privilege, or witness evidence being contaminated if they have an opportunity to read each other's evidence as part of the report. This could inhibit the fairness of any subsequent criminal trial.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The investigator may recommend further action, but should not decide whether allegations are true, or suggest a possible sanction or prejudge what the outcome of any subsequent disciplinary process would be.

The employer will need to consider whether it is necessary to commence disciplinary proceedings. For regulated businesses, there may be an obligation to inform their regulator of the investigation outcome. In some circumstances, the employer may feel the need to make an internal or external announcement about the outcome, and any action it intends to take to implement any recommendations made by the investigator. There may also need to be certain updates to policies or procedures as a result of the investigation.

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?

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

United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

Primarily, the investigation findings are disclosed to the employer and the employee under investigation. In scenarios involving allegations of a breach of regulatory duty or criminal law, the authorities may have the power to compel disclosure of any non-privileged materials generated in the investigation. Powers of compulsion do not apply to privileged materials.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

The investigation outcome may not need to be noted on the accused employee's record at all. Usually only the outcome of any subsequent disciplinary or grievance process would be noted, rather than the prior investigation.

The employer should keep the investigation report for as long as it remains relevant. This would usually be no longer than six years, unless regulatory obligations dictate otherwise. The report along with all documentation and witness statements gathered during the investigation should be retained securely and confidentially but for no longer than is absolutely necessary under the requirements of the DPA 2018 and the employer's data protection policies and procedures. There may be additional retention requirements in a regulated context; the position for each particular business and employee should be checked.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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



United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*
at Slaughter and May

A reasonable investigation is a key component of a fair disciplinary process. Errors in the investigation could therefore expose the employer to liability for unfair dismissal under ERA 1996.

Failure to follow the ACAS Code does not automatically make an employer liable in any proceedings taken against it. However, an employment tribunal will take the ACAS Code into account when deciding whether an employer has behaved fairly, and has the power to increase awards by up to 25% where it believes an employer has unreasonably failed to follow the ACAS Code's provisions.

There may be liability for breach of the employee's contract of employment if the employer breaches aspects of the investigation policy that are contractual, any contractual provisions relating to suspension, or otherwise conducts the investigation in a manner that breaches the implied term of trust and confidence.

There may be liability under the EA 2010 if the investigation is conducted in a discriminatory manner, which could include not making reasonable adjustments to the process for disabled employees.

Where the investigation involves protected disclosures, there may be liability under the whistleblowing provisions of ERA 1996 if the whistleblower is subjected to detriment or dismissal on the grounds of their protected disclosures.

Improper evidence gathering or processing may be actionable under the DPA 2018, IPA 2016 or the IP Regs 2018.

Finally, there may be common law claims in some circumstances (for example where reports need to be made to regulators, which in turn may affect the relevant employee's future employment prospects) for defamation, or, more unusually, for stress-related personal injury.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer



United Kingdom

Phil Linnard
Clare Fletcher
Slaughter and May

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com