Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

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

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

India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*
at Trilegal

As mentioned earlier, workplace investigations are normally a precursor to the actual disciplinary process against an employee. If the individual is being suspended during the investigation, the employer is only expected to inform the individual that they are being suspended on account of an ongoing investigation

along with the broad nature of allegations or concerns, and does not need to disclose specific details about the allegations until the appropriate time. Further details may be provided at the investigation stage itself when the employee may be interviewed, or at the subsequent disciplinary inquiry.

Where a disciplinary process is necessary and initiated (after the investigation), the employee will have to be given a charge sheet or notice setting out the allegations against the individual in detail and be provided with an opportunity to submit an explanation.

In sexual harassment investigations, the SH Act mandatorily requires the IC to submit a copy of the complaint to the accused. Further, the accused should be informed of the requirement to file his or her reply to the complaint along with a list of supporting documents, evidence, names and addresses of witnesses, etc, and the timelines for submitting his response in defence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

Contributors

Hong Kong

Wynne Mok
Jason Cheng
Audrey Li
Slaughter and May

India

Atul Gupta
Kanishka Maggon
Kopal Kumar
Trilegal

Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer