

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

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

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](#), 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](#), last visited on 17 June 2022.

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



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

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



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.

Contributors



Belgium

Nicolas Simon

Van Olmen & Wynant



Switzerland

Laura Widmer

Sandra Schaffner

Bär & Karrer