

# Workplace Investigations

## Contributing Editors

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

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



#### India

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

Yes, an employer can search its employees' official possessions and files as part of an investigation. It may be difficult, however, to seize personal assets or possessions of an employee (such as the individual's mobile phone or personal laptop).

Employers should expressly create policies that address key issues associated with employee surveillance, forensic searches and investigations, such as:

- whether or not the official assets and infrastructure of the company can be used for personal purposes by employees;
- the organisation's right to monitor, surveil or search any authorised or unauthorised use of its corporate assets; and
- that the employee should not have any expectation of privacy when using the companies' resources, etc.

Any forensic review of digital data must be carried out with due regard to Indian rules of evidence to avoid situations where such evidence becomes unreliable in a future legal claim or dispute.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



#### 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.<sup>[1]</sup> 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.<sup>[2]</sup>

---

[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

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



### India

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

The response and approach to this would be very fact-specific.

Under the SH Act, an individual cannot file an anonymous complaint and, therefore, the name of the complainant cannot be kept confidential. The same would go for details of witnesses, if any.

For other types of misconduct, the name of the complainant could potentially be kept confidential, depending on the nature of the allegations. For example, if an individual observes another colleague or employee committing inappropriate conduct (such as fraud or bribery) and reports this, the name of the complainant may not necessarily have to be disclosed to the accused employee, especially where the company is independently able to gather evidence substantiating the allegations. The names of witnesses generally cannot be kept confidential, since doing so may prove prejudicial to the accused employee. Further, as part of the disciplinary inquiry process, the accused has the right to cross-examine witnesses.

Notwithstanding the above, the approach to this issue should be assessed on a case-by-case basis by looking at the underlying sensitivities and risks involved. Courts have, in limited circumstances, permitted non-disclosure of the names of witnesses or complainants.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



### 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.<sup>[1]</sup>

---

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Contributors



### India

Atul Gupta  
Kanishka Maggon  
Kopal Kumar  
*Trilegal*



### Switzerland

Laura Widmer  
Sandra Schaffner  
*Bär & Karrer*

[www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com](http://www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com)