

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?

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

There is no specific legislation regarding a workplace investigation. In general, an employer has the right to investigate incidents at the workplace based on their authority over employees. However, the investigative powers of the employer are among others limited by the general right to privacy, which is also enshrined in Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 81 of 26 April 2002 to protect the privacy of employees concerning the control of electronic online data. If there are official complaints by employees due to sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, well-being legislation provides a specific procedure. Also, upcoming whistleblower rules include some specifications for an investigation, but at the time of publication these are not yet final (we refer to is in more detail below). The information below is only valid for workplace investigations in the private sector. The public sector has a set of specific rules and principles, which are outside the scope of this chapter.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

No specific rules directly govern a workplace investigation in the event of employee misconduct. However, several rules, both legal and administrative, affect the conduct of such an investigation. In addition, codes of conduct, internal regulations or guidelines may also exist within companies.

A new law (No. 2022-401) came into effect on 1 September 2022 and constitutes one of the cornerstones for future regulation of workplace investigations. This law transposes into French law the European directive relating to whistleblower protection. It does not, however, constitute a revolution, as a previous French law dated 9 December 2016 (the so-called Sapin 2 Law) already provided the whistleblower with a specific status and protection. These laws are fundamental when considering an internal investigation as the rules protecting the whistleblower and requiring the establishment of an internal whistleblowing channel (eg, a dedicated email or hotline) affect the degree of flexibility available to companies in

conducting the investigation.

A new decree has been adopted (No. 2022-1284), dated 3 October 2022, for application of these new provisions. This decree sets out several obligations relating to the internal whistleblowing reporting process. The reporting channel will necessarily contribute to shape the internal investigation triggered by situations which have been reported by that channel. Companies subject to this decree may define the reporting procedure using the supporting tool of their choice (company collective agreement, internal memorandum, etc.), as long as the employee representative bodies are duly consulted on the matter. The decree also specifies that an acknowledgement of receipt of the alert must be provided to the author of the alert in writing within seven days from the company receiving the alert. The author of the alert must also be informed in writing, within a reasonable period not exceeding three months from acknowledgement of receipt of the alert, of the measures envisaged or taken to assess the accuracy of the allegations and, where appropriate, to remedy the situation which had been reported, as well as the reasons for these measures and, finally, the closure of the case.

More generally, not only do all the “pure” labour law rules relating to the protection of the human rights of employees need to be complied with (right to privacy, data protection under the GDPR, etc), but also the disciplinary rules and regulations that protect employees from unfounded sanctions imposed by their employer. For example, an employer can only sanction an employee's misconduct if the disciplinary procedure begins within two months of when the misconduct was committed or when the employer becomes aware of it. In this respect, an internal investigation can be necessary for the employer to obtain full knowledge of the facts alleged to have been committed by the employee. It is nonetheless recommended that the internal investigation be completed within these two months to avoid the risk of the disciplinary action being time-barred.

Administrative rules produced by the French anti-corruption agency should also be taken into consideration (good practice, guidelines and recommendations relating to senior management's commitment to implement anti-corruption measures, corruption risk mapping, corruption risk management measures and procedures), as well as the guidelines produced by the French Ministry of Employment relating to the prevention of sexual harassment and gender-based violence or the recommendations of the Human Rights Defender, which is a French special institution aimed at protecting fundamental rights.

When the investigation in question concerns moral or sexual harassment or violence in the workplace, the national interprofessional agreement of 26 March 2010 should be referred to. This text stipulates that in the event of an investigation procedure, it should be based on, but not limited to, the following guiding principles:

- it is in everyone's interest to act with the discretion necessary to protect everyone's dignity and privacy;
- no information, unless it is anonymized, should be divulged to parties not involved in the case in question;
- complaints must be investigated and dealt with without delay;
- all parties involved must be listened to impartially and treated fairly;
- complaints must be supported by detailed information;
- deliberate false accusations must not be tolerated, and may result in disciplinary action;
- external assistance may be useful, notably from occupational health services.

Many are calling for the adoption of legislative rules governing such investigations, and their coordination with general whistleblower protection measures.

Finally, a company must take its own rules and regulations into account. Every company with at least 50 employees has the legal obligation to draw up internal rules and regulations, which notably set out the disciplinary sanctions applicable to employees, as well as a reminder of certain employees' rights.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

There is no legislation on this area in Poland. However, employers implement internal policies that provide for workplace investigation rules to fulfil certain legal obligations, including those arising directly from labour law.

Based on the currently binding provisions of labour law, an employer must counteract unwanted behaviour in the workplace (eg, bullying, discrimination and unequal treatment). To fulfil this obligation, employers implement internal policies that provide a framework for reporting misconduct and conducting internal investigations. They may freely design the rules of such investigations, within the constraints of their policy. Therefore, it is recommended they create the policy based on the following:

- it should be possible to effectively report the misconduct;
- there should be more than one way to report misconduct;
- anonymous reporting should be allowed;
- an investigation committee should be appointed and be objective;
- rules on excluding persons with a conflict of interest from conducting the investigation should be provided; and
- the report from the investigation should be prepared and signed by all persons participating in the process.

However, work on a bill on whistleblower protections is in progress (the Draft Law). The Draft Law will not determine the rules of workplace investigations but it will force employers to implement a whistleblowing procedure and follow-up on recommendations in the case of a report, including initiating an internal investigation where appropriate. Whether an internal investigation is initiated depends on the assessment of a reported irregularity by the employer.

In addition, employers (especially those that are part of an international group) often already implement internal policies on whistleblowing management and internal investigations. Employers often base their policies on guidelines issued by relevant (usually international) organisations.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

First, the employer should appoint an investigator or investigative team that will be responsible for conducting the investigation. Next, the employer or the investigators might think about communicating with the involved employees. It depends on the situation if this is a good idea or not. In general, it can be recommended that the employer is transparent towards the involved employees and openly communicates about the (start of the) investigation process. This is definitively the case if it is already clear that the involved employees are under scrutiny because of their actions. In this case, the actual investigation can begin with a hearing of the involved employees. However, if there is a risk that employees will hide or destroy evidence or will collude to prevent the employer from finding the truth, the investigation can also start without any communication. In this case, it would be better to start collecting evidence before hearing from the employees involved.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

When a report of wrongdoing is brought to the employer's attention, whether through a whistleblower or another channel, and an internal investigation is expected, it may be either mandatory or optional, depending on the facts of the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigation will be mandatory when the alleged wrongdoing relates to an ethical issue according to anti-corruption regulations, the employer's duty of due diligence regarding, for example, human rights or environmental matters, or where the works council has issued an alert relating to a "serious and imminent danger" (or to "fundamental human rights"), but also whenever it relates to the employer's obligation to ensure employee safety (eg, moral or sexual harassment).

If the investigation is not mandatory, it is up to the employer to decide whether or not to carry out the investigation. Several key questions can help the employer determine whether or not it is appropriate to carry out an investigation, such as:

- What are the benefits of doing nothing? The company will have to draw up a list of the pros and cons of an investigation, bearing in mind that in some cases a poorly conducted investigation could make the situation worse;
- What is the priority (eg, obtaining or securing evidence, or correcting the irregularity)?
- What rules or codes of ethics must the company comply with?
- Should external legal counsel only advise the company or should they play a major role in the investigation process by becoming an investigator?

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

There are no legal requirements in this respect – it depends on the internal policies or practices at a given working establishment. Based on our experience – an internal investigation usually commences with a preliminary assessment of a reported irregularity. If the preliminary assessment leads to a conclusion that a reported situation may be an irregularity, an investigation is launched by appointing a commission or team that conducts the investigation or selecting an investigator. Then, a plan of investigation is

established. Depending on the circumstances, the investigation plan may involve a collection of documents or files, their analysis, and interviews with a victim, witnesses or a subject (although the procedure depends on the type of case, internal rules and practice). At the end of the process, the report is prepared by the commission or team with facts established during the process, recommendations, and other suggestions as to the investigated issue.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In principle, you cannot unilaterally suspend an employee during a workplace investigation, as there is a risk of constructive dismissal (ie, wrongful termination of the employment contract by the unilateral modification of one of its essential elements). Consequences could include the payment of an indemnity in lieu of notice based on seniority as foreseen by the Employment Contracts Act, plus possible damages (three to 17 weeks remuneration if an unreasonable dismissal, plus alternative or additional damages based on real prejudice suffered). The parties can nevertheless agree on a suspension of the employment contract. In this scenario, the remuneration will still have to be paid. Furthermore, a suspension could be a sanction that follows the outcome of the investigation, but even then it will only be possible for a limited time (and a suspension without pay is usually only allowed by the courts for a maximum of three days). However, if the complaint is about sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, the prevention advisor

(see question 4) can recommend that the employer take certain actions, which in grave circumstances could lead to employee suspension. The suspended employee should continue to receive his pay if this occurs.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An employee may be suspended or relocated during a workplace investigation by:

- suspending the employee as a precautionary measure (eg, pending a confirmation of dismissal);
- temporarily assigning the employee to another site; or
- exempting the employee from having to work while continuing to pay them their salary.

The employee can be suspended as a precautionary measure, pending confirmation of dismissal, but this implies that disciplinary proceedings have already begun and that the investigation is therefore at a relatively advanced stage and that there is sufficient evidence to suggest the need for disciplinary action. It should be made clear to the employee that the suspension is a provisional measure (in the absence of specifying this, the suspension could be interpreted as a disciplinary layoff constituting a sanction and, in some jurisdictions, as depriving the employer of the possibility of dismissing the employee for the same facts).

Temporary reassignment can also be considered. However, this contractual change must not apply for long and the measure taken must be temporary. The employer must act promptly – the measure is only valid for as long as the investigation continues. Failing this, and because of the absence of concurrent disciplinary proceedings, there is considerable risk that the temporary reassignment may be reclassified by a judge as an illegal modification of the employment contract or as a disciplinary sanction preventing the employee from subsequently being dismissed.

Finally, paid exemption from work is also possible and consists of temporarily suspending, by mutual agreement, the obligation of the employer to provide work for the employee and the employee's obligation to work, without affecting their remuneration. Such a measure must generally be taken with the consent of the employee, because it implies a suspension (and therefore a modification) of the employment contract. This measure may be useful in temporarily removing an employee with whom the employer maintains a good relationship. This may be an employee who is or feels they are a victim of harassment, especially when the employee is not on sick leave.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

Polish law does not provide for the suspension of an employee. Instead, an employer may agree with an employee that he or she will be released from the obligation to perform work during a relevant period of investigation (with the right to remuneration). The employer may not do this unilaterally, unless the employee is in a notice period. As an alternative, which is more common in practice, the employer may force the employee to use outstanding holiday leave (subject to limitations provided by law) or the parties may mutually agree on the use of holiday leave or unpaid leave (if the employee has already used his or her holiday entitlement in full).

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, there are no legal minimum qualifications, the employer can delegate the investigation task to anyone. Of course, it is strongly recommended to appoint someone who is not involved in the case and who can lead the investigation objectively with the necessary authority to take investigative measures.

However, in the specific case of an official complaint due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the investigation will be conducted by the prevention advisor for psychosocial aspects. Next, if the investigation is based on an internal whistleblowing report, there will have to be an independent reporting manager responsible for receiving the report, giving feedback to the whistleblower and ensuring a decent follow-up to the report. Logically, the reporting manager will lead the investigation in this case, but he can be assisted by other persons or a team who are bound by a duty of confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In determining who is to conduct a workplace investigation, the main objective is to ensure that the team is independent or at least that it is perceived as being independent. The key people in the investigation team can be identified in a pre-established procedure. It is good practice to give decision-makers the possibility to set up, on a case-by-case basis, the team most appropriate to the situation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

There are no legal requirements in this regard but it is good practice if the team of investigators or individuals who deal with the case consists of:

- a person who has specific knowledge in a given field (concerning the violation);
- a member of the HR team; and
- a lawyer (it is recommended to engage an independent, external lawyer who can maintain the objectivity of the investigation, especially in complex matters or where a conflict of interest arises or may arise).

It is crucial that the investigators are independent (and they must be allowed to act independently).

Also, certain personal features are useful (eg, the ability to objectively assess a situation, empathy, and managing skills).

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

This is only possible if the employee claims that his or her rights (eg, the right to privacy) are violated by the investigation (but this will merely limit the investigation methods) or if he or she finds that the investigation constitutes an abuse of rights. In any case, it will be very hard for an employee to completely halt the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An internal investigation is not a police enquiry or a judicial instruction; there is no legal provision enabling an employee to stop the investigation. At the same time, there is no legal provision enabling the employer to force an employee to be interviewed. Interviewing an employee within the context of an internal investigation is also not a disciplinary matter. Therefore, the employee has no right to be assisted by another employee or an employee representative. The employee could, however, lawfully request the presence of their lawyer, especially if the company's lawyer is part of the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stepniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

This is unlikely. Theoretically, an employee can file a claim against an employer concerning the infringement of personal rights in the course of an investigation and a motion to secure his or her claims, which would consist of an employer being forced to suspend the proceedings, but in practice we have not encountered such a situation.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

Employees cannot be forced by their employer to act as a witness. If they decide to nonetheless testify as a witness, they do not, in principle, have particular rights. If the employee puts himself in a difficult or even

dangerous position to act as a witness, it is up to the employer to offer the necessary protection or take measures to prevent any harm (eg, by keeping the identity of the witness confidential or by planning the hearing at a place or time when the employees involved are not aware of it).

However, this is not the case for whistleblowing reports, where a witness might be seen as a “facilitator” who can receive protection against any retaliation by the employer.

Also, workers who were direct witnesses to official allegations of sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work are protected against retaliation by the employer. This also applies to witnesses in court.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Co-workers can spontaneously act as witnesses and provide statements to superiors before, during or after the interviews. Co-workers can also be interviewed as witnesses at the investigator’s request, although they are not under any obligation to answer the questions and they cannot be compelled to do so. The investigators have an absolute obligation of discretion during the investigation and cannot reveal any details of the information gathered.

Certain employees may benefit from whistleblower status, which implies that they may be exempt from potential criminal and civil liability relating to their report or testimony and they are protected from any retaliatory measures from the employer. “Facilitators” who helped the whistleblower and the individuals connected with the whistleblower and risk retaliatory measures by testifying as a witness may also benefit from this status, as of 1 September 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

In general, an employee may not be forced to act as a witness, but based on the provisions of the Polish Labour Code, an employee must act for the benefit of a working establishment or employer and perform work in line with the instructions of an employer. A lack of cooperation from an employee (eg, refusing to attend a hearing, hiding facts or even false testimony) may constitute a basis for the loss of an employer’s trust in the employee and, as a consequence, may constitute a valid reason for termination (in some specific situations, even without notice).

There is no formal protection for employees who act as witnesses. However, participation in an investigation cannot result in negative consequences (eg, no retaliation is allowed). Also, during an investigation, employees who are bound by professional secrecy are not required to provide information that would imply a breach of such secrecy.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

^[2] Same opinion: Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, published on [hrtoday.ch](https://www.hrtoday.ch), last visited on 17 June 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

Here, the investigation “collides” with the right to privacy of the persons involved.

First, the rules and principles of the GDPR will apply if personal data is involved. Therefore, the employer will have to find a data-processing ground, which could be his or her legitimate interest or the fact that the investigation could lead to legal proceedings, etc. The data processing should also be limited to what is proportionate and the data subjects should be informed. Due to this obligation, it is arguable that the GDPR policy already provides the necessary information for the employees not to jeopardise the investigation. In any case, data subjects should not be able to use their right to access data to ascertain the preliminary findings of the investigation (which are confidential) or any confidential identities involved (eg, in the whistleblower procedure, the identity of the report should be protected at all times).

Also, the employer should follow the procedure of Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 81 on searching the e-mails or computer files and internet searches of employees. This CBA limits the purposes for searches and lays down a double-phase procedure that needs to be followed if private data is involved. Next to this, the employer should also take into account the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, which only allows e-mail and computer searches based on the following:

- whether the employee has been notified of the possibility that the employer might take measures to monitor correspondence and the implementation of such measures;
- the extent of the monitoring and the degree of intrusion into the employee’s privacy (including a distinction between the monitoring of the flow or the content of the communications);
- whether the employer has provided legitimate reasons to justify monitoring of the communications

and accessing of their actual content; and

- whether it would have been possible to establish a monitoring system based on less intrusive measures, the consequences of the monitoring for the employee who is subject to it, and whether the employee had been provided with adequate safeguards.

Next, if the employer wants to use camera images, the rules of Collective Bargaining Agreement No. 68 should have been followed when installing cameras. If not, the images might have been collected illegally.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

GDPR principles fully apply to data gathering, as well as case law protecting the right to respect one's private life and the secret of correspondence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

If personal data is involved – the rules and principles of the GDPR will apply. If the physical evidence includes e-mail correspondence, files, or an employee's equipment and possessions, the Labour Code will apply (ie, as a general rule, to monitor it, a monitoring policy must be implemented at that working establishment). Such a policy must strictly determine the aim of the surveillance and an employer must only apply surveillance in situations that reflect this aim. Also, when it comes to monitoring correspondence, it must not infringe on the secrecy of the correspondence, which in practice means that the employer should not check employees' private correspondence when checking their business mailboxes.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

The employer is, in principle, not entitled to search the employee's private possessions, except with the explicit consent of the employee. Digital files on the computer or laptop of an employee can be searched under the rules of CBA No. 81 (see question 7) and other privacy rules.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In internal investigations, the fundamental rights and freedoms of employees are at stake, including the right to privacy, respect for the privacy of home life and correspondence, freedom of expression, and the obligation of loyalty in searching for evidence.

In principle, work emails and files can be reviewed, even without the employee's consent, prior knowledge or warning. This includes: work email accounts; files stored on a work computer or a USB key connected to a work computer; and SMS messages and files stored on a work mobile phone and documents stored in the workplace unless they are labelled as "personal". On the other hand, it is not permissible for an employer (or an investigator) to review "personal" emails and files, such as documents or emails identified as "personal" by the employee, or personal email accounts (Gmail, Yahoo, etc), even if accessed from a work computer.

There are certain exceptions to the above principle. An employer is allowed to check "personal" emails or data in any of the following cases:

- if the employee is present during the review;
- if the employee is absent, but was duly notified and invited to be present;
- if there is a particularly serious "specific risk or event";
- if the review is authorised by a judge (this means having to prove a legitimate reason justifying not informing the employee).

When documents or emails are not marked as “personal” but contain information of a personal nature, the employer may open and review the data but may not use such documents or emails to justify applying disciplinary measures to the employee or use such documents or emails as evidence in court if they indeed relate to the employee’s private life.

Special attention must be given to employee representatives who must be entirely free to carry out their duties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It depends on whether the employer implemented rules of personal control at the workplace. If yes, such rules are applicable. If not, in our opinion if there is suspicion of a serious violation, it is possible to carry out an ad hoc inspection but its scope should be limited only to necessary activities and should not concern an employee’s private files or correspondence, so as not to infringe on personal rights. If there is an ad hoc inspection, an employee should be informed in advance, and it should take place in the presence of the employee or employee’s representative, observing the rules of fairness and equity.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is based on a whistleblower report that falls under the scope of the upcoming rules, the investigators are bound by a strict duty of confidentiality, especially regarding the identity of the report. The rules also provide some procedural deadlines for feeding back to the reporter. Within seven days of receiving the report through an internal reporting channel, the reporting manager needs to send a receipt to the whistleblower. From that moment, the reporting manager has three months to investigate the report and give feedback and an adequate follow-up to the report. Next, the rules offer strong protection against any retaliatory measures the reporter may experience. Regardless, these rules are mostly intended to offer the necessary protection for whistleblowers and to ensure that companies take necessary investigative steps following a report, but they do not include much information about the actual procedure of the investigation besides certain deadlines, nor do they deal with other employees involved (or under investigation).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Evidence obtained in the context of an investigation must specify who provided it and the date it was provided. No retaliatory measures may be taken against the whistleblower for the act of whistleblowing.

In certain cases, the whistleblower report must be forwarded to the judicial authorities (eg, when there is an obligation to assist persons in imminent danger, for serious offences or a disclosure that a vulnerable person is in danger (ie, minors under 15 or a person who is unable to protect themselves)).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

In principle, an internal investigation should be conducted in the same way, regardless of whether it is initiated following a whistleblowing report, an audit, or a monitoring result. This includes anything related to confidentiality, fairness, data privacy protection, etc.

If an internal investigation is initiated following a whistleblower report, the main characteristic that is imposed by the EU Directive on the protection of persons who report breaches of EU Law (Whistleblowers Directive) and that will also be available under the Draft Law is for the organisation (employer) to communicate (if practicable) the report to the whistleblower. Furthermore, the whistleblower should receive feedback as to whether follow-up actions were undertaken following the report and, if yes – what actions were taken – and if not – why the follow-up actions were not taken.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

A workplace investigation is often a sensitive matter that requires necessary confidentiality to find out the truth discreetly and objectively. Nevertheless, there is often pressure from employees, trade unions or even the media and general public to be transparent and communicate about the case. From a legal perspective, it is not recommended to communicate openly about an ongoing investigation, as this can jeopardise the investigation or the possibility of taking disciplinary measures.

Whistleblower investigations will be bound by a strict duty of confidentiality regarding anything that could reveal the identity of the reporter.

In complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the prevention adviser is bound by professional secrecy. Consequently, he or she may not disclose to third parties any information about individuals that have come to his or her knowledge in the performance of his or her duties. However, he or she still has the freedom to inform the people concerned to carry out his or her tasks in the procedure.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Interviewers, investigators, interviewees or any others involved in the investigation are often bound by a reinforced confidentiality obligation, particularly when the internal investigation is triggered by a whistleblower alert. In addition, every person that comes to know of the investigation, facts or people involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. Furthermore, investigators should specifically be trained for interviews and be reminded of their obligations relating to the investigation.

The investigators will need to determine the order of the tasks to be carried out in the investigation, as this will have a significant impact on confidentiality management. Should they start with the hearings or a review of documents? The answer may depend on the subject matter of the investigation. It is advisable to first review the documentation before organising interviews, particularly to avoid the destruction of certain documents by employees acting in bad faith or by those wishing to erase the traces of alleged wrongdoing. Sometimes, however, it is possible to start with the interviews, especially in the case of harassment, as there may be no documents to review. If the decision is taken to conduct the documentation review after the interviews, it could be useful to ask the employees involved to sign a document stating that they must preserve and retain documents, meaning that if they delete or destroy documents, they would be acting against the company and in breach of the law.

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

The law does not cover this issue, apart from whistleblower regulations, as it should be regulated by the employer in their internal rules. The employer should ensure all participants of the investigation keep information related to it secret, as long as is necessary for the investigation (or even longer, if required by law concerning personal data or other specially protected information). Reputation, personal data and the personal rights of other people cannot be breached during the proceedings and this should be protected.

Moreover, according to the Draft Law – a whistleblower's personal data should be kept confidential. It can only be disclosed if law enforcement authorities require it. Also, confidentiality should be guaranteed for the subject and other interested persons.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, the employee should be informed that there is an ongoing investigation (unless this could jeopardise the investigation, in which case disclosure could be postponed until this is no longer the situation). Next, before imposing measures or sanctions, the employee should be allowed to be heard or to give his or her version of the facts. Of course, the employee can only do this if he or she is aware of the facts being investigated. It is not necessary to give the employee a full insight into the investigation, only the necessary facts that allow him or her to offer a defence are sufficient.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

According to the French data protection authority, the employee under investigation must be informed of the name of the person in charge of the investigation, the alleged facts that have led to the whistleblowing alert and their rights to access and rectify data collected about them. This information must be given as soon as the data collection starts, before the interviews, as per GDPR principles.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

There is no specific mandatory information that should be given to an employee who is the subject of an internal investigation. However, it is common practice that he or she must know what the allegations against them are, on what grounds these allegations are formulated and be given a right to discuss these allegations and the evidence or grounds for these allegations.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

As a result of the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations), employees under investigation have certain procedural rights. These include, in principle, the right of the accused to be heard. In this context, the accused has the right to be informed at the beginning of the questioning about the subject of the investigation and at least the main allegations and they must be allowed to share their

view and provide exculpatory evidence.[1] The employer, on the other hand, is not obliged to provide the employee with existing evidence, documents, etc, before the start of the questioning.[2]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



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

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The identity of the complainant must be kept confidential and cannot be disclosed. There are two exceptions: if the complainant consents to the disclosure; or if the employer is asked for this information by the judicial authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

Yes.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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.[\[1\]](#)

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In principle this is possible. However, these NDAs do have their limits and cannot prevent involved persons from, for example, bringing a legal claim or filing a report if they are legally entitled to do so. Under whistleblower rules, a reporter can even publish his or her complaint under certain circumstances.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Most of the time, the legal protection afforded by the legally prescribed confidentiality obligation that applies to whistleblowing is sufficient. This is all the more so given every person involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. However, there is no legal obstacle to the creation of an NDA between the employer and the people involved.

NDAs setting out a strict and reinforced obligation of confidentiality and discretion during the investigation should be signed by any external parties involved (eg, translation agency, IT expert) or when the internal investigation is outside the scope of whistleblowing regulations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

Yes, but it may not stop the disclosure of information at the request of relevant law enforcement authorities.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*

at Bär & Karrer

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is conducted by a prevention advisor, the investigation and the prevention advisor are bound and protected by a professional duty of confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Privilege does not generally apply to internal investigation materials as the investigation does not constitute a relationship between a lawyer and their client, and even less so a judicial investigation. However, if a lawyer is appointed as an investigator, privilege may apply to materials exchanged between the lawyer and that client.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

In general, findings made and documents established during an internal investigation, including the report thereof, are not covered by privilege per se. It can be claimed that they are covered by the employer's commercial secrecy, but this secrecy is not very well protected from requests of law enforcement authorities. Hence, if prosecuting authorities find a report of an internal investigation or other documents established during an investigation relevant for criminal proceedings, they can ask for them. If they are not produced voluntarily, a search can be performed.

Legal privilege will, on the other hand, cover an internal investigation if it is entrusted to an independent lawyer. Specifically, client-attorney privilege will cover all documents that are established during the investigation by a lawyer.

Under Polish law there is no distinction between legal advice privilege and litigation privilege. Hence, legal privilege will cover the documentation of the internal investigation led by a lawyer regardless of whether

the lawyer's involvement is for the purpose of obtaining legal advice or because of ongoing or contemplated litigation.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



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

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

An employee can be assisted by a member of a trade union. They are also free to consult a lawyer.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation has the right to be assisted by a lawyer during the interviews and, if the

employee chooses to be so, the lawyer must also always be present. The employee may not, however, be accompanied by anyone other than a legal representative (ie, another employee cannot attend the interview).

Last updated on 27/11/2023



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

This is not regulated by law and it depends on internal procedures or practice at a given working establishment. As a rule, the participation of third parties or proxies is neither a recognised practice nor recommended (according to the principle that the fewer people participate in the investigation, the easier it is to determine the circumstances of the case, the so-called need-to-know rule). However, in certain situations it should be permissible for a proxy (eg, a lawyer) to participate in a meeting with a subject.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

At the request of the involved employee, an employee can be assisted by a member of the trade union delegation, for example, during his or her hearing.

The works council should be informed of an investigation if there is a considerable impact on the company; this will only be the case if the investigation concerns a very serious, important or widespread issue. This information should be communicated as soon as possible and before measures are taken as a result of the investigation. This is only a right to information, not consultation. Moreover, members of the works council may be asked to respect their duty of confidentiality. However, as the enforcement of this duty of confidentiality is difficult, the timing of the information should be chosen wisely so it does not jeopardise the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Neither the works council nor the trade unions have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation. It is the employer who is responsible for carrying out the investigation. However, when the investigation is triggered due to a works council issuing an alert relating in particular to a “serious and imminent danger”, one member of the works council must be involved in the investigation process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

There is no such obligation, unless it is provided for in an internal procedure or, for example, in the applicable collective bargaining agreement. It is neither a recognised practice nor recommended that such persons participate in the investigation.

However, in the event of violations that justify the termination of an employment contract with the employee, the employer should consult with that employee’s union about their intention to immediately terminate any employment contract concluded with that person or to terminate, with notice, the employment contract agreed with him or her for an indefinite term, or apply for consent to terminate the employment contract with an employee who is protected by a union.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

There are no other mandatory support measures. However, an employer is free to offer additional support, for example, by granting leave from work. If tensions at the workplace are high, it may be a good idea to ask the employee under investigation to take some leave. Some companies also provide certain legal, moral or even psychological support. If the complaint concerns sexual harassment, bullying or violence at work, the prevention adviser can also recommend that the employer take additional measures to support certain employees.

Furthermore, under the whistleblower rules, an external reporting authority can grant any support measure (eg, legal advice or financial, technical, psychological or media-related, social support).

For complaints due to sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, and if the facts are serious, the prevention adviser should, during the examination of the request and before giving his or her opinion to the employer, propose protective measures to the employer. These measures are necessary to avoid serious damage to the complainant's health or a significant deterioration in the situation (for example, causing opposing parties to commit criminal offences). The final decision on taking these measures rests with the employer. This means that the employer does not necessarily have to take the measures proposed by the prevention adviser. They may take other measures that provide an equivalent level of protection for the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Apart from being informed of any facts and data concerning them being collected during the investigation, employees involved in the investigation do not have any specific rights. Some companies choose to use external firms specializing in psychosocial risk management, not only to conduct internal investigations, but also to provide additional psychological support for their employees, as part of the employer's safety obligation.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

They may be supported by, for example, allowing an alternative work environment (eg, remote work to avoid direct contact with people involved in the case). Depending on circumstances of the case, this solution will be offered to the subject or the victim. However, it is important that such actions do not infringe the rights of other people (eg, the subject itself).

Employees may also be sent on leave (by a unilateral decision of the employer – if possible under currently binding law provisions) or the parties to an employment contract may mutually agree to use such leave. Moreover, if the employer thinks it is necessary, they may assign the employee to another job for a period not exceeding three months (only if it does not result in a reduction in the employee's remuneration and corresponds to the employee's qualifications).

Also, depending on the employer's decision – psychological or even legal assistance can be provided by the employer to a whistleblower or a victim.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is not protected by confidentiality towards the employer (e.g. the prevention advisor cannot disclose confidential information to the employer), it could result in further measures taken by the employer or lead to a new investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Unrelated matters revealed during the investigation do not necessarily mean that another investigation will be opened. Nevertheless, if reprehensible acts unrelated to the current investigation are revealed, the employer will need to take action and sanction the perpetrator (after checking the facts). Sometimes the only way to check the facts is to carry out another investigation on a separate matter. However, the investigation team may also consider if there is enough connection between the matters to widen the scope of the current internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It depends on the circumstances of the revealed issue and the employer's compliance culture. Normally, if a new issue is revealed during the investigation, it should be analysed and investigated if appropriate.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

This will depend on where the employee raises a grievance and the content of the grievance. If it is against the employer, the investigation can take this into account and continue from there. If the grievance is raised against the authorities, it will depend on the steps taken by the authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The grievance may also have to be investigated (eg, moral/sexual harassment reported by an employee under investigation).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It depends on the internal policies in force in the organisation. Most often, it constitutes the basis for separate proceedings.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

Switzerland

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off

sick during the investigation?



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If this occurs, there is a risk that any measure resulting from the investigation (eg, a dismissal) can be (wrongly) interpreted as discrimination based on the illness of the employee. However, if the employer can prove that the measure is not related to the illness but solely related to the investigation (which is also not related to the illness), there may be no discrimination. The sickness of the employee may prevent the continuation of the investigation because, for example, it becomes impossible to hear from the employee. In this instance, the investigation can be suspended, postponed or extended until the employee returns. If it is a long-term absence, this could lead to a disproportionate amount of time to complete the investigation. Therefore, the employer should take any necessary steps to invite the ill employee to a hearing anyway (eg, through digital means). If the employee unreasonably refuses (several) of these invitations, it could be argued that the employee is wilfully boycotting the investigation and therefore forfeits his or her opportunity to be heard.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The investigation will likely be able to continue with the other employees and, as soon as the employee under investigation returns from sick leave, they will be able to be interviewed.

However, as disciplinary sanctions are time-barred after two months from the moment the misconduct was committed or from when the employer becomes aware of it, if the sick leave lasts for the whole of that period, the investigation must be conducted anyway. In this instance, the investigator can ask the employee to attend the interview despite being on sick leave or arrange for the interview to take place using other means (eg, conference call). As a last resort, a questionnaire can be sent to the employee, but the pros and cons must be assessed as this is a way of information gathering that carries a certain amount of risk, could be less reliable and is of less probative value.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

This may prolong the investigation, as the employee may be unable to participate for a time (if the employee is not able to work, in many cases he or she will not be able to participate in proceedings that requires some level of engagement and psychophysical ability). Also, an employee is protected against termination of an employment contract with notice during sick leave. During such a period, the employer may only terminate his or her employment contract without notice (with immediate effect).

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In legal proceedings, a criminal procedure takes precedence over civil procedures. However, disciplinary internal proceedings (like a workplace investigation) and an investigation by the authorities may run parallel to each other. If the public investigation leads to a court procedure that results in the acquittal of the employee under investigation, it could lead to legal problems if the employer has already imposed sanctions based on the same employee. Therefore, the employer could make the internal investigation dependent on the public investigation, and could take preventive measures while awaiting the outcome.

The public authorities normally have the legal competence to request information that can help them in their investigation. Therefore, they could rightfully ask the employer to share evidence or findings from the internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

A criminal investigation always takes precedence over other investigations. However, this does not mean that the internal investigation has to stop. It can and should continue, and the report drawn up upon completion of the investigation could be used by the authorities in the criminal investigation. In some cases, especially when privilege does not apply, police or regulatory authorities may request that the

employer share such evidence. However, even when privilege does apply, there is no certainty that the evidence would not have to be communicated to certain authorities.

Some administrative authorities often challenge the application of legal privilege or try to reduce its scope. For example, the French financial markets authority (AMF) regularly puts forward its view of legal privilege, according to which an email where a lawyer is only copied (and is not one of the main recipients) in from one of their clients is not confidential and can therefore be disclosed in proceedings. However, if the AMF investigators impose disclosure of privileged documents, this should result in the annulment of the investigation procedure. By way of exception, legal privilege cannot be invoked against certain other authorities, such as the URSSAF (authority in charge of collecting social security contributions) or the DGCCRF (directorate-general for competition, consumer protection and anti-fraud investigations). Where legal privilege is enforceable, the judge must first determine whether the documents constitute correspondence relating to defence rights and, second, must cancel the seizure of documents that they find to be covered by legal privilege due to the principle of professional secrecy of relations between a lawyer and their client and the rights of defence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

They can be run in parallel. It is up to the company whether it informs the authority about the ongoing internal investigation.

Based on our experience in criminal matters, a report from an internal investigation may not necessarily be treated as evidence per se, but as a source of information about the evidence.

According to procedural rules stemming from, for example, the Criminal Procedure Code, the authorities can demand to see evidence and documents in the employer's possession that they consider relevant to the conducted proceedings and their subject matter.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

It is highly recommended to inform the employee under investigation of the outcome. If disciplinary measures are imposed upon him or her, the legal procedure must be followed and the sanction must be imposed or communicated the day after the employer or his delegate has established the wrongdoing of the employee.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation, like the other employees interviewed and the whistleblower, must be informed that the investigation has been completed. However, there is no obligation to provide them with the report and, for reasons of confidentiality, it is very often best not to do so.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

He or she must be given feedback about follow-up actions that were undertaken, or reasons why the follow-up actions were not undertaken.

In any case – the feedback must be adapted to the circumstances of each case so as not to reveal too many details or infringe the other interested parties' rights.

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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:

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

It is recommended to limit the communication to the findings and details of the report that are necessary for the employee to fully understand the outcome. This is especially true if the investigation is bound by a duty of confidentiality (eg, under the whistleblowing rules), as the employee should not be allowed access to the full report.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

There is no obligation to share the investigation report. The findings, or a summary of them without revealing any confidential information, may be disclosed, but it is the employer's responsibility to keep the identity of every person interviewed confidential.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It does not need to be shared with the employees at all. It may be shared only to the extent such a disclosure will not violate any law, including personal data protection law or personal rights.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation leads to the establishment of grave errors by the employee, this can lead to sanctions. The employer must follow the procedure laid down in the internal work rules of the company and can only impose sanctions that are included in the internal work rules. In general, these are: a verbal warning; a written warning; a suspension (remunerated or not); a fine (capped to one-fifth of daily remuneration); and dismissal. If there are very serious errors leading to an immediate inability to continue the employment relationship with the employee, the employer can dismiss the employee with urgent cause without any notice period or indemnity in lieu of notice (following the specific procedure for these types of dismissals). In less serious cases, the employer could still dismiss the employee with a notice period or indemnity in lieu of notice. In principle, the employer has a right to dismiss the employee, even if this sanction is not included in the internal work rules.

As said previously, disciplinary sanctions (included in the internal work rules) must be communicated to the sanctioned employee the day after the employer or his delegate has established fault. The sanction must be registered in a sanction register, with the name of the employee, the date, the reason and the nature of the sanction. If there is a fine, the amount of the fine should be mentioned. The proceeds of the fines must be used for the benefit of employees. Where a works council exists, the use of the proceeds of the fines must be determined after consultation with it.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employer can decide to sanction the person who was under investigation or to close the case. The employer may also need to protect any victims, witnesses and whistleblowers. If, during the investigation, it is discovered that a supplier or other commercial partner is implicated, the relevant contract may be

terminated. The employer can take legal action , file a complaint (if the company is a direct victim of a criminal offence) or report the offence to the public prosecutor's office. The employer must archive the file or ensure its lawful preservation after a certain period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It depends on the outcome of the investigation: imposing penalties; reporting to a regulator; notifying a suspected offence or civil claim; termination of an employment contract with or without notice; and changes to the work organisation. Following the investigation, the employer must make some legal, business or HR corrective actions.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigated acts constitute a crime, the authorities or the police should be informed. In certain cases,

not doing so could lead to the company being accused of concealing a crime or becoming jointly responsible for it. However, if the company is the only victim of the crime and it is minor, the company may choose not to inform the authorities. For example, there is an enormous difference between a bank employee stealing large amounts of money from clients and an employee who is stealing toilet paper from the company. As stated above, the interview records could be at risk of disclosure if the authorities or police seize them for their investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The findings must be submitted to the employer or management, but there is no obligation to disclose them to anybody else. The only exception is if a judicial investigation has been opened. In this case, the entire report must be provided to the authorities if the judge requests this. Normally the investigators only take written notes and there is no audio or video recording, unless the employee consents. Whether or not to make a voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing is a tactical decision for companies. Disclosure may mitigate fines and penalties or even help the employer avoid liability entirely. However, the downsides of disclosure include increased costs, the possibility of a follow-on government investigation and exposure to penalties. Thus, most companies assess their options on a case-by-case basis to determine what steps would be in the best interests of the company.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

It depends on the matter. In general, there is no obligation to disclose the report. In some instances, there is an obligation to notify a suspected offence (for example, a terrorist attack or a political assassination). This, however, does not mean there is an obligation to file a report from the internal investigation, but to provide the law enforcement authority with the facts and evidence at the notifier's disposal. In other instances of criminal offences, for example corruption, there is no obligation to notify law enforcement authorities. Therefore, it is up to the organisation to decide whether it will file a notification for a suspected offence.

At the same time, presenting a report from an internal investigation can constitute an element of defence for an organisation if a regulatory authority initiates proceedings regarding a failure by the organisation to comply with regulatory obligations.

Records of interviews do not need to be produced for the case file provided the law enforcement authority does not ask for them.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

According to the GDPR, personal data should only be stored for a proportionate amount of time. Usually, this means that it can be stored as long as it is relevant for the employment contract, and even afterwards, if there is a risk of legal proceedings (ie, regarding the dismissal of the employee).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

If the outcome of the internal investigation has led to the sanctioning of an employee, this sanction may no longer be invoked to support a new sanction after three years. Moreover, under the GDPR principles, the duration of retention must be proportional to the use of the data. Therefore, the data must be retained only for a period that is “strictly necessary and proportionate”. If the employer wants to keep information about the investigation in the longer term, it is possible to archive the employee's record even though the employer will no longer be able to use it against the employee after three years.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Poland

Neither Polish law nor the Draft Law specifically provide for a mandatory period during which the outcome of the investigation should be kept on the employee's record.

At the same time, the Draft Law indicates that the register of whistleblowing reports, which should also contain information about follow-up actions undertaken as a result of the report, should be kept for 15 months starting from the end of the calendar year in which the follow-up actions have been completed, or the proceedings initiated by those actions have been terminated.

Also, while determining how long the outcome of an internal investigation should be kept, additional legal considerations can be taken into account, especially data privacy.

The GDPR does not specify precise storage time for personal data. The employer must assess what will be an appropriate time for storage of the data, taking into consideration the necessity of keeping personal data concerning the purpose of the processing in question. Employees' personal data should be kept for the period necessary for the performance of the employment relationship and may be kept for a period appropriate for the statute of limitations for claims and criminal deeds. A longer retention period may result from applicable laws. Following the Regulation of the Minister of Family, Labour and Social Policy on employee documentation, the employer may keep a copy of the notice of punishment and other documents related to the employee's incurring of disciplinary responsibility in the employee record.

There are different retention periods for the data contained in employee files:

- 10 years if the employee was hired on or after 1 January 2019;
- if the employment relationship began between 1 January 1999 and 1 January 2019, the retention period is 50 years, but may be reduced to 10 years if the employer provides the Polish Social Insurance Institution with certain mandatory information; and
- for 50 years if the employee was hired before 1 January 1999. It does not matter whether the person is still working or not.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



Switzerland

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*
at Van Olmen & Wynant

In general, abusive investigations could lead to a legal claim regarding the abuse of rights. During an investigation, an employer should be guided by principles of due diligence and not take disproportionate action. If the investigation causes unnecessary damage, involved employees could file for compensation (eg, before the labour court). Next, the employer is also responsible for following the mandatory procedure for official complaints regarding sexual harassment, bullying and violence at work and investigations of whistleblower reports. In the first case, an employer who does not follow the procedure or obstructs the procedure can be liable for penal or administrative fines (maximum 8,000 euro) or, if the employer has not taken necessary measures to mitigate the risks for the employee and the employee suffers damage to their health, they may be liable for a fine of a maximum of 48,000 euro and imprisonment for between six months and three years. In the second case (whistleblower procedure), if an employer did not follow or has obstructed the procedure, they can be fined up to 5% of the annual revenue of the preceding year.

If the complaints involve allegations of sexual harassment, violence or bullying at work, the employer might risk an investigation of the inspection on supervision and well-being at work. If the prevention advisor finds out, before giving his advice, that the employer did not take any suitable protective measures after they were recommended, the prevention advisor is obliged to call an inspection on supervision and well-being at work.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Within the context of an investigation following a whistleblower alert, any violation of the confidentiality obligation is punishable by two years' imprisonment and a €30,000 fine.

If the employer fails to comply with its obligation to protect its employees' safety, the employer will be liable for damages resulting from any failings during the investigation (eg, if sexual harassment is reported and no action is taken by the employer)

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*
at WKB Lawyers

If any untrue allegations were made by an employer against an employee without checking them beforehand, there is a risk that such an employee would claim damages eg, for infringement of personal rights or even filing a private indictment for defamation or outrage.

Certainly, an employer must be aware that one must never behave in a way that, for example, in the employee's opinion, could constitute a form of blackmailing or deprivation of liberty. A problem may also arise when accessing the employee's correspondence, especially when access is made to documents or private correspondence. The Draft Law provides for several criminal offences related to, for example, preventing reporting, using retaliatory measures against a whistleblower or disclosing personal data of a whistleblower).

Last updated on 20/04/2023

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.

Contributors



Belgium

Nicolas Simon
Van Olmen & Wynant



France

Pascale Lagesse
Valentino Armillei
Bredin Prat



Poland

Wioleta Polak
Aleksandra Stępniewska
Julia Jewgraf
WKB Lawyers



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer