International Employment Lawyer

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The Employment Ordinance (EO), which is the primary legislation governing employment relationships in Hong Kong, does not provide for a statutory workplace investigation procedure.

The Labour Department of Hong Kong has, however, published a Guide to Good People Management Practices[1] which recommends that employers lay down rules of conduct, grievance and disciplinary procedures. Such rules should be simple and clear, logical and fair, and in line with the provisions in the EO.

As part of risk management and internal controls, Hong Kong-listed companies are expected by The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited (SEHK) to establish whistleblowing policies and systems for employees to raise concerns about possible improprieties with independent board members. Listed companies are also expected to establish policies for the promotion and support of anti-corruption laws and regulations. Such

policies and systems may include workplace investigation procedures.[2] If a listed company chooses to not establish such policies and systems, it is required to explain how it could achieve appropriate and effective risk management and internal controls.

---

[1] Hong Kong Labour Department, “Guide to Good People Management Practices” (June 2019) <https://www.labour.gov.hk/eng/public/wcp/practice.pdf>.

[2] SEHK, Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited, Appendix 14, Provision D.2.6, D.2.7. SEHK, “Corporate Governance Guide for Boards and Directors” (December 2021) <https://www.hkex.com.hk/-/media/HKEX-Market/Listing/Rules-and-Guidance/Corporate-Governance-Practices/guide_board_dir.pdf>.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The circumstances in which an employer commences a workplace investigation may vary. However, it is common that an employer will consider it necessary to commence a workplace investigation upon receipt of a complaint concerning a fellow employee. Sometimes, the complaint may be made anonymously. If the employer considers there to be substance in the complaint, it may commence an investigation to find out the truth of the matter, resolve the complaint and, if necessary, improve its systems and controls to prevent the reoccurrence of any misconduct.

A workplace investigation may be warranted if the employer receives an enquiry from a regulator concerning its affairs or an employee’s conduct. The investigation findings could enable the employer to respond to the regulator (which could be a mandatory obligation) and at the same time assess its risk

exposure.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

It may be appropriate to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation, for instance, where the investigation has revealed misconduct on his or her part (even on a preliminary basis), or his or her continued presence in the business would hinder the progress of the investigation. However, the employer will have to consider the relevant legislative provisions and the terms of the employment contract before making any decision on suspension.

Under section 11 of the EO, an employer may suspend an employee without pay pending a decision as to whether the employee should be summarily dismissed (up to 14 days) or pending the outcome of any criminal proceedings against the employee arising out of his or her employment (up to the conclusion of the criminal proceedings). If an employee is suspended as above, however, the employee may terminate his or her employment without notice or payment in lieu of notice.

It is more common for an employer to suspend an employee with pay during an investigation concerning his or her conduct rather than exercising its statutory right as mentioned above. This could avoid an unnecessary dispute with the employee concerned. Indeed, it is common for employers to include in employment contracts specific provisions to give themselves the right to suspend an employee with pay in certain circumstances. The provisions normally set out the circumstances in which the employer may exercise the right, the maximum period of suspension and other arrangements during the suspension

period (eg, how the employee's entitlements under the employment contract are to be dealt with).

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

There are no statutory or regulatory requirements regarding the choice of investigator in workplace investigations. However, it is good practice to have the investigation conducted by persons who have been trained to do so as investigations may involve intricate issues. It is also important that the investigators are perceived to be impartial and fair. For that reason, the investigators should be individuals who are not involved in the matter under investigation.

Complex cases or cases that involve a senior employee may require someone more senior within the company to lead and oversee the conduct of the investigation. This also applies where it is foreseeable that the investigation may lead to disciplinary action, summary dismissal of the employee or a report to an authority.

Engagement of external parties or professional advisors may be necessary if the conduct under investigation is serious or widespread and may lead to regulatory consequences, or if the employer does not have the requisite expertise to handle the investigation. Lawyers (whether in-house counsel or external lawyers) may be the best fit to conduct a workplace investigation to ensure that legal professional privilege attaches to documents and communications created during the investigation (please see question 14).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

05. Can the employee under investigation bring legal

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the investigation is conducted in a manner that is contrary to an express term of the employment contract or the implied obligation of trust and confidence of the employer under common law (please see question 11), the employee may have a claim for breach of contract and possible remedies may include declaratory and injunctive relief against the investigation.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Under Hong Kong law, the employee has an implied duty to obey lawful instructions from his or her employer and to serve the employer with fidelity and good faith during the term of his or her employment. A lawful instruction from an employer may include a reasonable request for the employee to participate and provide information in the workplace investigation. If the employee refuses to comply with such instruction or is obstructive or provides untrue or misleading information, it could constitute a ground for summary dismissal under the EO and at common law.

That said, in general terms, an employer should not compel any employee to testify against a co-worker, particularly if such a co-worker is a senior colleague, as evidence provided under compulsion may not be helpful to the investigation.

Employees who act as witnesses must be treated as per their contractual and statutory rights, including the right against self-incrimination. If the investigation involves allegations of discrimination on the ground of sex, race or disability, the employer should ensure that the witnesses will not be victimised or treated less favourably than other employees.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If physical evidence contains data relating to an individual, from which the identity of the individual can be ascertained,[1] the data would constitute personal data under the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486) (PDPO). The PDPO sets out several data protection principles that the employer must comply with while processing personal data, including:[2]

- personal data must be collected for a lawful purpose related to a function or activity of the employer and should not be excessive for this purpose. An internal investigation would be regarded as a lawful purpose;
- personal data must be accurate and not kept longer than is necessary;
- personal data must not be used for a purpose other than the internal investigation (or other purposes for which the data was collected) unless the employee consents to a new use or the new use falls within one of the exceptions provided in the PDPO;
- personal data must be safeguarded against unauthorised or accidental access, processing or loss; and
- the employee whose personal data has been collected has the right to request access to and correction of his or her personal data retained by the employer.

If an employer wants to gather evidence through employee monitoring, it should ensure that the act of monitoring complies with the data protection principles of the PDPO if the monitoring activity would amount to the collection of personal data. The Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data has issued guidelines to employers on the steps they can take in assessing whether employee monitoring is appropriate for their businesses.[3] As a general rule, employee monitoring should be conducted overtly. Further, those who may be affected should be notified in advance of the purposes the monitoring is intended to serve, the circumstances in which the system will be activated, what personal data (if any) will be collected and how the personal data will be used.

Covert surveillance of employees should not be adopted unless it is justified by relevant special circumstances. Employers should consider whether there is reason to believe that there is an unlawful activity taking place and the use of overt monitoring would likely prejudice the detection or collection of evidence.[4] Even if covert monitoring is justified, it should target only those areas in which an unlawful activity is likely to take place and be implemented for a limited duration of time.

---

[1] PDPO section 2.

[2] PDPO Schedule 1.

[3] PCPD, “Privacy Guidelines: Monitoring and Personal Data Privacy at Work” (April 2016) <https://www.pcpd.org.hk/english/data_privacy_law/code_of_practices/files/Monitoring_and_Personal_Data_Privacy_At_Work_revis_Eng.pdf>.

[4] Ibid at paragraph 2.3.3.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

As part of an investigation, an employer may search objects or files that are the company's property (eg, electronic devices given by the employer for business purposes and emails or messages stored on the company's server) without prior notice and the employee's consent is not needed. The employer, however, has no right to search an employee's possessions (eg, a private smartphone) without the employee's consent.

To avoid arguments as to who a particular object belongs to, employers may specify in internal policies what is to be regarded as a corporate asset and could be subject to a search in a workplace investigation.

Concerning an employee's possessions, even if he or she consents to a search, it is good practice for the employer to conduct the search in the presence of the employee or an independent third party who can act as a witness to the search. If the employer suspects that a criminal offence has been committed and that a search of the employee's possessions would reveal evidence, the employer should consider reporting its suspicion to the police, as they have wider legal powers to search.[1]

---

[1] Usually upon execution of a warrant.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Hong Kong does not have a comprehensive legislative framework relating to whistleblowing. Therefore, in general, employers are free to establish whistleblowing policies and procedures and confer such protections on whistleblowers as they see fit. That said, companies listed on the Main Board of the SEHK are expected to establish a whistleblowing policy and system for employees to voice concerns anonymously about possible improprieties in the companies' affairs. If a listed issuer deviates from this practice, it must explain the deviation.[1]

When an investigation involves whistleblowing, the employer needs to comply with the relevant policy and system and provide the whistleblower with such protections as stated in the policy. The employer should not ignore a complaint simply because it was made anonymously, and should ascertain the substance of the complaint to decide whether a full-blown investigation is warranted.

In addition, the employer should seek to establish a secure communication channel with the whistleblower to gather more information about the complaint or misconduct while maintaining the confidentiality of his or her identity. If the complaint is serious, the employer may consider referring the complaint to a law enforcement agency or regulator as they would be better placed in protecting the anonymity of the whistleblower while proceeding with the investigation. That said, employers generally have no obligation to report internal wrongdoing to any external body (please see question 25 for exceptions). The employer may assess whether it is appropriate to do so on a case-by-case basis.

---

[1] The Corporate Governance Code, Appendix 14 of the Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Workplace investigations should usually be conducted on a confidential basis to preserve the integrity of the investigation, avoid cross-contamination of evidence and maintain the confidentiality of the employee under investigation. This means that those involved in the investigation (ie, the subject employee and any material witnesses) should be made aware of the fact and substance of the investigation on a need-to-know basis.

While the extent of the confidentiality obligations are usually governed by the employer's internal policies and the employment contract, there are circumstances where the employer has a statutory duty to keep information unearthed in the investigation confidential. For instance, if it is found that certain property represents proceeds of an indictable offence[1] or drug trafficking[2], or is terrorist property[3], the employer should report its knowledge or suspicion to the Joint Financial Intelligence Unit (JFIU) as soon as is reasonably practicable and avoid disclosure to any other person as such disclosure may constitute "tipping off". Another example is if a workplace investigation is commenced in response to a regulatory enquiry, the employer may be bound by a statutory secrecy obligation and may not be at liberty to disclose anything about the regulatory enquiry to anyone including those who are subject to the workplace investigation. For example, section 378 of the Securities and Futures Ordinance (SFO) imposes such a secrecy obligation on anyone who is under investigation or assists the Securities and Futures Commission (SFC) in an investigation.[4]

---

[1] OSCO section 25A(5). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine of $500,000 and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of $100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[2] DTROPO section 25A(1). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction on indictment to a fine of $500,000 and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of $100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[3] UNATMO section 12(1). A person who contravenes the section is liable on conviction to a fine and to imprisonment for 3 years, or upon summary conviction to a fine of $100,000 and to imprisonment for 1 year.

[4] A person who fails to maintain secrecy is liable upon conviction on indictment to a maximum fine of $1 million and imprisonment for up to two years (or upon summary conviction, to a maximum fine of $100,000 and imprisonment for up to six months).

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

An employer's internal policies or the employment contract may provide that an employee under investigation should be given certain information concerning the allegations raised against him or her. Such policies or terms should be followed and failure to do so may result in a claim for breach of contract or constructive dismissal by the employee. Even where there are no express provisions, the employer still owes an implied obligation of trust and confidence towards the employee at common law, which requires the employer not to, without reasonable and proper cause, conduct itself in a manner calculated and likely to destroy or seriously damage the relationship of confidence and trust between itself and the employee.[1] In the context of an internal investigation, the implied duty would require the employer to conduct the investigation and reach its findings reasonably and rationally following the evidence available and in good faith. This would normally require that sufficient information about the allegations made against the employee be provided to him or her such that he or she has the opportunity to properly respond to the allegations before any disciplinary action is taken or any decision about his or her employment is made.

---

[1] Malik v Bank of Credit and Commerce International SA (In Liquidation) [1998] AC 20.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Subject to any internal policies and terms of the employment contract, an employer would have discretion as to whether the identity of the complainant, witnesses or sources of information for the investigation should be kept confidential. In general, the employer should consider how the confidential treatment or its absence would affect the conduct and outcome of the investigation. The disclosure of the identity of the complainant in some cases may be necessary for the employee under investigation to respond in a meaningful way. On the other hand, both the complainant and witnesses may be more forthcoming in providing information if he or she is assured that his or her identity will not be made known to the person under investigation (especially if the latter is senior management personnel). A balance should be struck between the interests of the complainant or witnesses in maintaining confidentiality and the need for the employee under investigation to make a proper response to the allegations made. In any case, the employer should follow its whistleblowing policy if there is one (as discussed in question 9), and take into account practical and statutory considerations relating to confidentiality (as discussed in question 10).

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

In general terms, NDAs can be used and indeed are commonly used to keep the fact and substance of a workplace investigation confidential. However, NDAs will not be effective in preventing the disclosure of information which is in the public interest or is important for safeguarding public welfare in matters of health and safety. Further, several laws in Hong Kong provide that disclosures as a result of compliance with a requirement made by the relevant authorities will not be treated as a breach of any restriction imposed by contract or otherwise by law.[1]

---

[1] The Drug Trafficking (Recovery of Proceeds) Ordinance (Cap. 405), the Organized and Serious Crimes Ordinance (Cap. 455), and the United Nations (Anti-Terrorism Measures) Ordinance (Cap. 575)

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Legal professional privilege may attach to investigation materials if they are generated for the sole or dominant purpose of giving or obtaining legal advice (legal advice privilege); or created with the sole or dominant purpose of either obtaining or giving advice about or obtaining evidence to be used in an actual or reasonably contemplated litigation (litigation privilege).[1] Legal advice privilege applies to confidential communications between lawyers and their clients, whereas litigation privilege may extend to communications between lawyers, clients and third parties. The employer may withhold disclosure of any materials that are subject to either legal advice or litigation privilege.

In the context of a workplace investigation, internal interview records are protected by legal advice privilege if the dominant purpose of creating those records is to seek legal advice on potential disciplinary action against the employee. Such interview records are protected by litigation privilege if they are created to obtain evidence in an actual or reasonably contemplated litigation.

It should be noted that the point in time at which the sole or dominant purpose is judged is when the document is created. In other words, a document is not covered by litigation privilege if it was not created for litigation purposes but was subsequently used to obtain legal advice for litigation.[2] On a practical point, if the employer would like to minimise disclosure of the investigation by claiming privilege over relevant materials, it may wish to limit the number of documents created and persons to which they are circulated to avoid potential waiver of privilege.

---

[1] White Book 2023, 24/5/16, 24/5/18; Litigation privilege applies to adversarial proceedings, but not inquisitorial or administrative proceedings (White Book 2023, 24/5/28).

[2] White Book 2023, 24/5/18.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Absent any right conferred by the employment contract or the relevant internal policy, employees do not have a right under Hong Kong law to be accompanied or have legal representation during an investigation meeting or interview. While the employee being investigated is entitled to seek his or her own legal advice during the investigation, employers have discretion on whether to allow the employee to be accompanied or represented by his or her legal adviser in an investigation meeting or interview. That said, to ensure fairness in the process and to avoid unnecessary allegations of undue influence, the employer may consider allowing the employee to have legal representatives present, especially if serious allegations are made against the employee and the outcome of the investigation could have a significant impact on the employee's future.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Unless the employment contract or the relevant internal policies specify otherwise, there is no automatic right under Hong Kong law for a works council or trade union to be informed or involved in a workplace investigation.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

It could be stressful for employees to be involved in a workplace investigation, whether as the victim, the subject of an investigation or a witness. More transparency in the process would help reduce stress. This could be achieved by providing the relevant employees with the timeline for different stages of the investigation and regular updates.

The employer may also consider providing mental health support to the employees concerned, for example in the form of counselling services or medical consultations. Where appropriate, the employer may also consider making reasonable adjustments to the employee's workload and work schedule to facilitate his participation in the investigation.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If unrelated matters are revealed during the investigation, the employer should consider whether an investigation is needed. If yes, the employer should decide whether it is appropriate to incorporate the new matters into the scope of the existing investigation by expanding the terms of reference. However, it may not be appropriate to do so if different individuals are concerned or such inclusion would unduly complicate or delay the progress of the existing investigation. If that is the case, the employer should commence a separate investigation.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

As discussed in question 11, an employer owes an implied obligation of trust and confidence towards its employees under common law. This means that an employer cannot disregard a genuine complaint made by an employee even if the employee is under internal investigation. The employer may have put in place an employee grievance handling policy, which should be followed when handling the employee's grievance.

If the grievance raised relates to how the workplace investigation is being conducted (for example, it is alleged that the investigator has a conflict of interest or is biased), the employer should consider suspending the investigation until this grievance is properly addressed to ensure fairness. However, if the grievance is nothing but an attempt to delay or hinder the investigation, the employer may be entitled to proceed with the investigation regardless. The employer should therefore carefully assess the nature and validity of any grievance raised in each case. The employer should also consider its rights under the employment contract if the employee is being uncooperative or obstructive.

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 extendeded 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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the employee under investigation goes off sick, the employer should ascertain the medical condition of the employee and when he or she is likely to return to fitness. If the employee is unlikely to return to work for a reasonable time, the employer should consider what adjustments can be made to the investigation process to continue with the investigation. If the employee's input is necessary for the conclusion of the investigation, the employer may invite the employee to provide information by way of a written questionnaire or to attend a virtual meeting. However, the employee may not necessarily agree to these proposals, especially if he or she is unwell. In such circumstances, the employer may not be able to conclude the investigation in the absence of the employee.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

Where there is a parallel criminal or regulatory investigation, the employer should handle the workplace

investigation with extra care and ensure that it complies with all applicable legal requirements or lawful requests made by the relevant authorities concurrently. While there may be reasons why the employer wants to progress with its investigation as soon as possible, the employer should not take any steps that hinder or obstruct the parallel investigations. Therefore, it may be appropriate for the employer to stay its workplace investigation if its continuation may prejudice the parallel investigations.

The employer may also find itself duty-bound to stay the workplace investigation if it is subject to statutory secrecy obligations vis-à-vis the relevant law enforcement agency or regulatory body. As mentioned in question 10, several laws in Hong Kong impose secrecy obligations on any person who has acquired confidential information about certain law enforcement agencies or regulatory bodies and the investigations being conducted. The employer should assess whether they could continue with the workplace investigation without breaching secrecy obligations. The employer should take a prudent approach and may discuss with the relevant authority before proceeding further with its workplace investigation.

Depending on the nature of the matter, authorities in Hong Kong handling a criminal or regulatory investigation may be empowered to seize, or compel persons who are the subject of an investigation or assisting in such an investigation (which may include the employer) to produce, documents or evidence that are relevant to the matters being investigated. For example:

- the police or the Independent Commission Against Corruption may, under a search warrant (or in certain circumstances, without a warrant), inspect and take possession of articles or documents inside the premise of the employer they reasonably suspect to be of value to the investigation of the suspected offence; and
- the SFC or the Competition Commission may, under the SFO or Competition Ordinance (as applicable), require the employee under investigation or the employer to produce documents, attend interviews, and, specifically for the SFC, provide the investigator with all assistance he or she can give. Both authorities may also obtain a warrant from the Hong Kong courts to search the premise of the employer and obtain documents or information it reasonably believes to be relevant to its investigation.

Documents created and evidence gathered by the employer during its workplace investigation (such as witness statements or investigation reports) may be subject to production requests of, or may be seized by, the authorities mentioned above (unless legal professional privilege is attached). The employer should ensure that it complies with all lawful requests from the authorities.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The employer is generally not obliged under Hong Kong law to inform the employee under investigation of the outcome of the investigation absent any express obligation under the employment contract, even where the investigation has led to a decision to terminate the employee. However, to avoid any unnecessary claim of unlawful dismissal or dismissal without a valid reason, the employer should inform the employee of the reason for his or her termination, even if the investigation results may not be shared in full with the employee.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

The employer is generally not obliged to share the investigation report or the findings with the employee under Hong Kong law, absent any express obligations under the employment contract.

However, according to the PDPO, the content of the investigation report or meeting minutes related to the employee (including any findings and opinions expressed in such documents) are likely to constitute the personal data of the employee under investigation. In that case, the employee may have a right under the PDPO to obtain a copy of such documents by making a statutory data access request after the workplace investigation is completed. The employer's obligation to comply with such request is subject to certain exemptions under Part 8 of the PDPO, which include (among others) an exemption on the provision of personal data held for the prevention, preclusion or remedying of unlawful or seriously improper conduct, and the disclosure of which would be likely to prejudice the said purpose or directly or indirectly identify the person who is the source of the data.[1] Therefore, where there is a parallel criminal proceeding or investigation that has not been concluded, the employer may reject an employee's data access request on the basis that the requested disclosure may prejudice the prevention and remedy of the unlawful conduct. Further, any information protected by legal privilege is also exempt from disclosure under Part 8 of the PDPO.[2]

If the requested documents also contain the personal data of any other third parties (such as other co-workers of the employee who have also participated in the investigation), the employer should always

redact or erase such data before providing the requested documents to the employee under investigation, unless the relevant third parties have consented to the disclosure of the data.

---

[1] PDPO sections 20 and 58(1)(d).

[2] PDPO sections 20 and 60.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the outcome of the investigation reveals that misconduct has been committed by the employee, the employer may consider whether it should allow the employee to defend him or herself against such findings. If the employment contract or relevant internal policies specify a right to be heard on the part of the employee through a disciplinary hearing before any actions can be taken against him or her, such procedures should be followed.

Assuming the employer maintains its findings that the employee has committed misconduct after the conclusion of the disciplinary hearing (if any), the employer may consider taking one of the following disciplinary actions against the employee depending on the nature and severity of the misconduct:

- Verbal or written warning – this is a common form of disciplinary action. The employer may consider including the nature of the misconduct and the potential consequences of repeating such misconduct (for example, termination of employment) in the warning to be given to the employee;
- Termination with notice – the EO allows employers and employees to terminate the employment with notice. It is not necessary to give reasons for the termination unless the employee concerned has been employed for at least 24 months, in which case the employer shall demonstrate a valid reason for the termination as defined under the EO;
- Suspension – the employer may suspend the employee without pay for up to 14 days in circumstances where the misconduct concerned justifies a summary dismissal, or where a decision on summary dismissal is pending. The employee may also be suspended where there is a criminal proceeding against him or her relevant to the investigation, until the conclusion of the criminal proceeding (as discussed in question 3);[1] and
- Summary dismissal – the employer may terminate an employment contract without notice if the employee is found to have:
    - wilfully disobeyed a lawful and reasonable order;
    - failed to duly and faithfully discharge his duties;
    - committed fraud or acted dishonesty; or
    - been habitually neglectful in his duties.[2]

---

[1] EO section 11(1).

[2] EO section 9. The employer is also entitled to summarily dismiss an employee on any other ground on which he would be entitled to terminate the contract without notice at common law.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*

at Slaughter and May

As mentioned in questions 21, 22 and 23, under Hong Kong law, the employer is generally not obliged to actively disclose the findings of a workplace investigation to any party.

Having said that, the employer should be aware of certain statutory disclosure requirements that may become applicable as a result of the matters revealed during the workplace investigation. For example, if the investigation reveals or gives rise to any knowledge or suspicion that any property represents the proceeds of an indictable offence[1], drug trafficking[2], or terrorism[3], the employer is required to report its knowledge or suspicion, together with any matter on which that knowledge or suspicion is based, to the JFIU as soon as is reasonably practicable (even where the investigation has not yet been concluded). Employers who are licensed corporations must also provide the SFC with information about whether departing licensed employees were the subject of an internal investigation in the six months prior to his/her departure. If the internal investigation commences after the departure of the licensed employee, the licensed corporation should notify the SFC as soon as practicable[4].

In any event, as in question 14, if any documents related to the investigation are protected by legal professional privilege, they can generally be kept confidential and would not be subject to disclosure even if the employer is subject to a mandatory reporting or disclosure obligation.

---

[1] OSCO section 25A(1).

[2] DTROPO section 25A(1).

[3] UNATMO section 12(1).

[4] Frequently Asked Questions on “Disclosure of investigations commenced by licensed corporations in the notifications of cessation of accreditation” issued by the SFC on 21 May 2019 <https://www.sfc.hk/en/faqs/intermediaries/licensing/Disclosure-of-investigations-commenced-by-licensed-corporations#627D0257CCA8410189F48C1A68443112>.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

There is no legal requirement in Hong Kong on this. However, since the investigation records will likely contain personal data, employers should be mindful of the requirement under the PDPO that personal data should not be kept for longer than necessary.[1]

According to the Code of Practice on Human Resources Management published by the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data, generally, employment data about an employee can be kept for the entire duration of his or her employment, plus a recommended period of no more than seven years after the employee leaves employment unless there is a subsisting reason that justifies a longer retention period. A longer retention period may be justified where there is ongoing litigation or a parallel investigation. Even where it is deemed necessary to retain the outcome of the investigation concerning a departed employee, the employer should ensure that other personal data on the employee's record (that is unrelated to the purpose of retention) are erased after the expiry of the recommended retention period.

---

[1] DPP2 (in Sch. 1) and PDPO section 26.

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

Hong Kong

Author: *Wynne Mok, Jason Cheng, Audrey Li*
at Slaughter and May

If the employer failed to comply with a requirement that is expressly stipulated in the employment contract or employee handbook (such as a procedural requirement to hold a disciplinary hearing or to provide certain information to the employee), the employer could be liable for breaching an express term in the employment contract.

Even where the employment contract does not contain express provisions for the conduct of an internal investigation, the employer is under an implied obligation of trust and confidence under common law (as discussed in question 11), which requires it to conduct the investigation and reach its findings reasonably and rationally in accordance with the evidence available and in good faith.[1] If the employer reached a decision that no reasonable employer would have reached, the conduct of the investigation may be in breach of the employer's implied obligation of trust and confidence.

If the error in the investigation has led to a termination of employment (whether by way of summary dismissal or termination by notice), the employee may be able to bring a statutory claim for wrongful dismissal, unlawful dismissal or dismissal without a valid reason (as applicable).[2] If such a claim is successful, in addition to ordering the employer to pay monetary compensation, the court or tribunal may also make a reinstatement order (an order that the employee shall be treated as if he had not been dismissed) or re-engagement order (an order that the employee shall be re-engaged in employment on terms comparable to his or her original terms of employment) for the affected employee.

The employer may also be liable for unlawful discrimination under Hong Kong law if the investigation has been conducted in a discriminatory manner or the outcome of the investigation reflects differential and less favourable treatment of the employee concerned based on grounds of sex, marital status, disability, family status or race.

---

[1] Chok Kin Ming v Equal Opportunities Commission [2019] HKCFI 755

[2] EO sections 9 and 32K.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors

Belgium

Nicolas Simon
Van Olmen & Wynant

Hong Kong

Wynne Mok
Jason Cheng
Audrey Li
Slaughter and May