

# Workplace Investigations

## Contributing Editors

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

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

### 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

### South Korea

Author: *Hyunjae Park, Paul Cho, Jihay Ellie Kwack, Kyson Keebong Paek*  
at Kim & Chang

There is no obligation to stay the workplace investigation while the parallel criminal or regulatory investigation is being conducted. In practice, companies often proceed with, or even accelerate, the

workplace investigation to find out the facts and defend themselves against the parallel criminal or regulatory investigation being conducted. The company should be careful not to engage in activities that may raise suspicions as to whether the company is impeding the government investigation or concealing or destroying evidence.

While the investigation report would typically not be privileged, the company may consider explaining to the authorities that the investigation findings are not conclusive, should the police or regulator request the internal investigation report.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## 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

### Contributors



## France

Pascale Lagesse  
Valentino Armillei  
*Bredin Prat*



## South Korea

Hyunjae Park  
Paul Cho  
Jihay Ellie Kwack  
Kyson Keebong Paek  
*Kim & Chang*



## Switzerland

Laura Widmer  
Sandra Schaffner  
*Bär & Karrer*