

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?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

No specific rules directly govern a workplace investigation in the event of employee misconduct. However, several rules, both legal and administrative, affect the conduct of such an investigation. In addition, codes of conduct, internal regulations or guidelines may also exist within companies.

A new law (No. 2022-401) came into effect on 1 September 2022 and constitutes one of the cornerstones for future regulation of workplace investigations. This law transposes into French law the European directive relating to whistleblower protection. It does not, however, constitute a revolution, as a previous French law dated 9 December 2016 (the so-called Sapin 2 Law) already provided the whistleblower with a specific status and protection. These laws are fundamental when considering an internal investigation as the rules protecting the whistleblower and requiring the establishment of an internal whistleblowing channel (eg, a dedicated email or hotline) affect the degree of flexibility available to companies in conducting the investigation.

A new decree has been adopted (No. 2022-1284), dated 3 October 2022, for application of these new provisions. This decree sets out several obligations relating to the internal whistleblowing reporting process. The reporting channel will necessarily contribute to shape the internal investigation triggered by situations which have been reported by that channel. Companies subject to this decree may define the reporting procedure using the supporting tool of their choice (company collective agreement, internal memorandum, etc.), as long as the employee representative bodies are duly consulted on the matter. The decree also specifies that an acknowledgement of receipt of the alert must be provided to the author of the alert in writing within seven days from the company receiving the alert. The author of the alert must also be informed in writing, within a reasonable period not exceeding three months from acknowledgement of receipt of the alert, of the measures envisaged or taken to assess the accuracy of the allegations and, where appropriate, to remedy the situation which had been reported, as well as the reasons for these measures and, finally, the closure of the case.

More generally, not only do all the “pure” labour law rules relating to the protection of the human rights of employees need to be complied with (right to privacy, data protection under the GDPR, etc), but also the disciplinary rules and regulations that protect employees from unfounded sanctions imposed by their employer. For example, an employer can only sanction an employee's misconduct if the disciplinary procedure begins within two months of when the misconduct was committed or when the employer

becomes aware of it. In this respect, an internal investigation can be necessary for the employer to obtain full knowledge of the facts alleged to have been committed by the employee. It is nonetheless recommended that the internal investigation be completed within these two months to avoid the risk of the disciplinary action being time-barred.

Administrative rules produced by the French anti-corruption agency should also be taken into consideration (good practice, guidelines and recommendations relating to senior management's commitment to implement anti-corruption measures, corruption risk mapping, corruption risk management measures and procedures), as well as the guidelines produced by the French Ministry of Employment relating to the prevention of sexual harassment and gender-based violence or the recommendations of the Human Rights Defender, which is a French special institution aimed at protecting fundamental rights.

When the investigation in question concerns moral or sexual harassment or violence in the workplace, the national interprofessional agreement of 26 March 2010 should be referred to. This text stipulates that in the event of an investigation procedure, it should be based on, but not limited to, the following guiding principles:

- it is in everyone's interest to act with the discretion necessary to protect everyone's dignity and privacy;
- no information, unless it is anonymized, should be divulged to parties not involved in the case in question;
- complaints must be investigated and dealt with without delay;
- all parties involved must be listened to impartially and treated fairly;
- complaints must be supported by detailed information;
- deliberate false accusations must not be tolerated, and may result in disciplinary action;
- external assistance may be useful, notably from occupational health services.

Many are calling for the adoption of legislative rules governing such investigations, and their coordination with general whistleblower protection measures.

Finally, a company must take its own rules and regulations into account. Every company with at least 50 employees has the legal obligation to draw up internal rules and regulations, which notably set out the disciplinary sanctions applicable to employees, as well as a reminder of certain employees' rights.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



South Korea

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

While there are no specific laws that regulate a workplace investigation, there are several laws that companies should consider when conducting a workplace investigation concerning alleged employee misconduct.

One key example is the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA). The WPA provides legal protection to a whistleblower if their allegations are raised in good faith and are in the public interest as specified under the WPA. If the WPA applies, certain obligations apply to the company, including but not limited to the following:

- the obligation to protect the confidentiality of the whistleblower's identity;
- protecting the whistleblower if the whistleblower suffers or is likely to suffer serious harm to life or health as a result of whistleblowing and the whistleblower requests protection; and
- refraining from taking retaliatory action on the whistleblower.

Therefore, if an employee raises allegations of another employee's misconduct, the company should review whether the allegations fall under the WPA.

There are also special laws that impose obligations on the company if there are certain types of allegations

(eg, sexual harassment, workplace harassment).

In addition, when collecting and reviewing employees' electronic data, such as emails or files stored in work laptops or company servers, which may contain personal information, the company should comply with data privacy laws discussed in more detail in questions 7 and 8.

Companies may also have internal policies (eg, whistleblower protection policies, Code of Conduct) that may apply to workplace investigations, aside from the requirements under Korean law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

There is no specific legal regulation for internal investigations in Switzerland. The legal framework is derived from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights. Depending on the context of the investigation, additional legal provisions may apply; for instance, additional provisions of the Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection or the Swiss Criminal Code.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

When a report of wrongdoing is brought to the employer's attention, whether through a whistleblower or another channel, and an internal investigation is expected, it may be either mandatory or optional, depending on the facts of the alleged wrongdoing.

The investigation will be mandatory when the alleged wrongdoing relates to an ethical issue according to anti-corruption regulations, the employer's duty of due diligence regarding, for example, human rights or environmental matters, or where the works council has issued an alert relating to a "serious and imminent danger" (or to "fundamental human rights"), but also whenever it relates to the employer's obligation to ensure employee safety (eg, moral or sexual harassment).

If the investigation is not mandatory, it is up to the employer to decide whether or not to carry out the investigation. Several key questions can help the employer determine whether or not it is appropriate to carry out an investigation, such as:

- What are the benefits of doing nothing? The company will have to draw up a list of the pros and cons of an investigation, bearing in mind that in some cases a poorly conducted investigation could make the situation worse;
- What is the priority (eg, obtaining or securing evidence, or correcting the irregularity)?
- What rules or codes of ethics must the company comply with?
- Should external legal counsel only advise the company or should they play a major role in the investigation process by becoming an investigator?



South Korea

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

There are many different ways a workplace investigation concerning employee misconduct could commence. Below are some key examples from our experience:

- an employee reports allegations concerning another employee's misconduct through an ethics hotline or other means (eg, email, phone call);
- an outsider such as a former employee or a vendor reports allegations concerning employee misconduct to a company officer;
- an internal audit reveals potential employee misconduct;
- media reports raise allegations of employee misconduct; and
- an external investigation begins (eg, by criminal authorities or administrative agencies) concerning alleged employee misconduct.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

Internal investigations are usually initiated after reports about possible violations of the employer's code of conduct, applicable laws or regulations have been submitted by employees to their superiors, the human resources department or designated internal reporting systems such as hotlines (including whistleblowing hotlines).

For an internal investigation to be initiated, there must be a reasonable suspicion (grounds).^[1] If no such grounds exist, the employer must ask the informant for further or more specific information. If no grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the case must be closed. If grounds for reasonable suspicion exist, the appropriate investigative steps can be initiated by a formal investigation request from the company management.^[2]

^[1] Claudia Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz: Ein Handbuch für regulierte Finanzinstitute und andere Unternehmen*, Zürich/St. Gallen 2013, p. 21.

^[2] Klaus Moosmayer, *Compliance, Praxisleitfaden für Unternehmen*, 2. A. München 2015, N 314.

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)?



France



Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An employee may be suspended or relocated during a workplace investigation by:

- suspending the employee as a precautionary measure (eg, pending a confirmation of dismissal);
- temporarily assigning the employee to another site; or
- exempting the employee from having to work while continuing to pay them their salary.

The employee can be suspended as a precautionary measure, pending confirmation of dismissal, but this implies that disciplinary proceedings have already begun and that the investigation is therefore at a relatively advanced stage and that there is sufficient evidence to suggest the need for disciplinary action. It should be made clear to the employee that the suspension is a provisional measure (in the absence of specifying this, the suspension could be interpreted as a disciplinary layoff constituting a sanction and, in some jurisdictions, as depriving the employer of the possibility of dismissing the employee for the same facts).

Temporary reassignment can also be considered. However, this contractual change must not apply for long and the measure taken must be temporary. The employer must act promptly – the measure is only valid for as long as the investigation continues. Failing this, and because of the absence of concurrent disciplinary proceedings, there is considerable risk that the temporary reassignment may be reclassified by a judge as an illegal modification of the employment contract or as a disciplinary sanction preventing the employee from subsequently being dismissed.

Finally, paid exemption from work is also possible and consists of temporarily suspending, by mutual agreement, the obligation of the employer to provide work for the employee and the employee's obligation to work, without affecting their remuneration. Such a measure must generally be taken with the consent of the employee, because it implies a suspension (and therefore a modification) of the employment contract. This measure may be useful in temporarily removing an employee with whom the employer maintains a good relationship. This may be an employee who is or feels they are a victim of harassment, especially when the employee is not on sick leave.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

The company may place an employee who is subject to a workplace investigation under administrative leave if this seems necessary or appropriate to ensure the integrity of the workplace investigation. While administrative leave can take different forms, one way is to issue a "standby order" to the relevant employee, instructing him or her not to come into work and prohibiting contact with other employees or customers while the workplace investigation is ongoing.

Administrative leave is not a disciplinary action, but rather an exercise of the company's authority to take personnel management measures. This authority is generally subject to a "reasonableness" test, with the Korean courts balancing the employer's business necessity in placing the employee on administrative leave with the inconvenience caused to the employee. In conducting the balancing test, the Korean courts have considered whether the employee receives pay during the leave and the duration of the leave, among other things. In general, if the duration of the leave is not excessive and is with full pay and benefits, the employer's management prerogative is likely to be recognised.

The company doesn't need to obtain the employee's consent but, in practice, a company should consider getting the employee's acknowledgement that they have received the administrative leave notice.

In addition to Korean labour law, other factors such as the company's rules of employment or a collective

bargaining agreement (if any) may affect the company's ability to place the employee on administrative leave, by providing for prescribed procedures for placing an employee on administrative leave or requiring the company to obtain the union's consent if a union leader or executive is involved.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

It is possible to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation.^[1] While there are no limits on duration, the employee will remain entitled to full pay during this time.

[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 181.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

04. Who should conduct a workplace investigation, are there minimum qualifications or criteria that need to be met?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In determining who is to conduct a workplace investigation, the main objective is to ensure that the team is independent or at least that it is perceived as being independent. The key people in the investigation team can be identified in a pre-established procedure. It is good practice to give decision-makers the possibility to set up, on a case-by-case basis, the team most appropriate to the situation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

While there are no laws that set minimum qualifications for who should conduct a workplace investigation, companies often engage external legal counsel to ensure the investigation is conducted in an unbiased and professional manner. If the company itself undertakes the workplace investigation, the company should take precautions such as ensuring that the person conducting the investigation is not biased and not involved in the alleged wrongdoing. If the person conducting the investigation cannot converse in the native language of the employee under investigation, the company may consider arranging for an interpreter when conducting interviews, to minimise the risk of misunderstanding.



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The examinations can be carried out internally by designated internal employees, by external specialists, or by a combination thereof. The addition of external advisors is particularly recommended if the allegations are against an employee of a high hierarchical level^[1], if the allegations concerned are quite substantive and, in any case, where an increased degree of independence is sought.

[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 18.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

05. Can the employee under investigation bring legal action to stop the investigation?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

An internal investigation is not a police enquiry or a judicial instruction; there is no legal provision enabling an employee to stop the investigation. At the same time, there is no legal provision enabling the employer to force an employee to be interviewed. Interviewing an employee within the context of an internal investigation is also not a disciplinary matter. Therefore, the employee has no right to be assisted by another employee or an employee representative. The employee could, however, lawfully request the presence of their lawyer, especially if the company's lawyer is part of the investigation team.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

An employee under investigation cannot bring legal action (eg, an injunction) to stop a workplace investigation. However, there have been instances where an employee under investigation raised legal challenges concerning the investigation (eg, breach of privacy). Please see question 19. While the company would not be legally compelled to stop the investigation when legal challenges are raised, they may face penalties under the relevant laws if it is determined they have committed a violation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The accused could theoretically request a court to stop the investigation, for instance, by arguing that there is no reason for the investigation and that the investigation infringes the employee's personality rights. However, if the employer can prove that there were grounds for reasonable suspicion and is conducting the investigation properly, it is unlikely that such a request would be successful.

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?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Co-workers can spontaneously act as witnesses and provide statements to superiors before, during or after the interviews. Co-workers can also be interviewed as witnesses at the investigator's request, although they are not under any obligation to answer the questions and they cannot be compelled to do so. The investigators have an absolute obligation of discretion during the investigation and cannot reveal any details of the information gathered.

Certain employees may benefit from whistleblower status, which implies that they may be exempt from potential criminal and civil liability relating to their report or testimony and they are protected from any retaliatory measures from the employer. "Facilitators" who helped the whistleblower and the individuals connected with the whistleblower and risk retaliatory measures by testifying as a witness may also benefit from this status, as of 1 September 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

South Korea

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

While there are no laws to compel co-workers to act as witnesses, the company may have internal policies (eg, rules of employment, code of conduct) that require employees to cooperate with company actions such as a workplace investigation. That said, it would be difficult to enforce such policies even if the employee refuses to cooperate (eg, taking disciplinary action against an employee who refuses to act as a witness).

There may be instances when the company is required to provide certain legal protection to employees acting as witnesses in an investigation. For example, if a whistleblower falling under the WPA is required to act as a witness, they would be entitled to legal protections as discussed in question 1. The company may also have internal policies that provide protection to employees acting as witnesses in an investigation.

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](https://www.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](https://www.hrtoday.ch), last visited on 17 June 2022.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

07. What data protection or other regulations apply when gathering physical evidence?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

GDPR principles fully apply to data gathering, as well as case law protecting the right to respect one's private life and the secret of correspondence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

South Korea

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

It may be difficult for a company to search and collect physical items that personally belong to the employee.

While the company may search and gather electronic data, such as emails or files stored in work laptops or company servers, there are requirements and restrictions under the Criminal Code, the Personal

Information Protection Act (PIPA), and the Act on Promotion of Information and Communications Network Utilisation and Information Protection, etc (Network Act), among other laws.

Article 316(2) of the Criminal Code states that accessing the contents of another person's documents, pictures, special media records, etc, that are sealed or designated as secret using technical means may constitute the crime of accessing electronic records.

Under the PIPA, consent must be obtained from the information owner to collect or use personal information, or to provide such information to a third party. Consent must be separately obtained for sensitive information or unique identification information. There are strict requirements as to the format and contents of the consent forms under the PIPA.

The Network Act prohibits accessing an information and communications network without rightful authority or any intrusion that goes beyond the permitted authority for access. Although this may not be an issue if a company directly manages the email accounts at issue, if an employee's email account is protected by a password or through other means, accessing emails from that account without obtaining the employee's consent could constitute unlawful intrusion under the Network Act as well as under the Criminal Code as discussed above.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection applies to the gathering of evidence, in particular such collection must be lawful, transparent, reasonable and in good faith, and data security must be preserved.^[1]

It can be derived from the duty to [disclose and hand over benefits received and work produced](#) (article 321b, Swiss Code of Obligations) as they belong to the employer.^[2] The employer is, therefore, generally entitled to collect and process data connected with the end product of any work completely by an employee and associated with their business. However, it is prohibited by the Swiss Criminal Code to open a sealed document or consignment to gain knowledge of its contents without being authorised to do so (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code). Anyone who disseminates or makes use of information of which he or she has obtained knowledge by opening a sealed document or mailing not intended for him or her may become criminally liable (article 179 paragraph 1, Swiss Criminal Code).

It is advisable to state in internal regulations that the workplace might be searched as part of an internal investigation and in compliance with all applicable data protection rules if this is necessary as part of the investigation.

^[1] Simona Wantz/Sara Licci, Arbeitsvertragliche Rechte und Pflichten bei internen Untersuchungen, in: Jusletter 18 February 2019, N 52.

^[2] Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 148.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

In internal investigations, the fundamental rights and freedoms of employees are at stake, including the right to privacy, respect for the privacy of home life and correspondence, freedom of expression, and the obligation of loyalty in searching for evidence.

In principle, work emails and files can be reviewed, even without the employee's consent, prior knowledge or warning. This includes: work email accounts; files stored on a work computer or a USB key connected to a work computer; and SMS messages and files stored on a work mobile phone and documents stored in the workplace unless they are labelled as "personal". On the other hand, it is not permissible for an employer (or an investigator) to review "personal" emails and files, such as documents or emails identified as "personal" by the employee, or personal email accounts (Gmail, Yahoo, etc), even if accessed from a work computer.

There are certain exceptions to the above principle. An employer is allowed to check "personal" emails or data in any of the following cases:

- if the employee is present during the review;
- if the employee is absent, but was duly notified and invited to be present;
- if there is a particularly serious "specific risk or event";
- if the review is authorised by a judge (this means having to prove a legitimate reason justifying not informing the employee).

When documents or emails are not marked as "personal" but contain information of a personal nature, the employer may open and review the data but may not use such documents or emails to justify applying disciplinary measures to the employee or use such documents or emails as evidence in court if they indeed relate to the employee's private life.

Special attention must be given to employee representatives who must be entirely free to carry out their duties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

South Korea

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

As discussed in question 7, it may be difficult for a company to search an employee's personal possessions. The company may search and gather electronic data stored in work laptops or company servers, subject to legal requirements and restrictions (eg, obtaining consent).

The PIPA provides specific guidance on the requirements for obtaining consent. Under the PIPA, to collect or use an individual's personal information, the information holder must be informed of and consent to:

- the purpose of the collection or use;
- the personal information that will be collected;
- the period of retention and use; and
- his or her right to refuse to provide consent and any disadvantages that may result from such refusal.

There are separate requirements for obtaining consent to provide an individual's personal information to a third party. Also, consent must be obtained separately for the collection, use or provision of sensitive or unique identification information.

Under limited circumstances, personal information may be collected, used, or provided to third parties

without obtaining the consent of the information holder. For instance, a company may collect and use personal information without obtaining consent where obtaining the information is necessary to achieve the company's "legitimate interests", which clearly exceed the information holder's right to his or her personal information, and the collection and use are carried out within reasonable bounds. The term "legitimate interests" in this context is generally understood as a concept similar to "justifiable act" under the Criminal Code. The Korean Supreme Court has held that under exceptional circumstances such as the following, the company's collection and review of employee data may constitute a "justifiable act" under the Criminal Code:

1. the company had specific and reasonable suspicion that the employee had committed a crime and the company had an urgent need to verify the facts;
2. the scope of the company's review was limited to the suspected crime through the use of keywords, etc;
3. the employee had signed an agreement stating that he or she would not use work computers in an unauthorised manner and that all work products would belong to the company; and
4. the company's review uncovered materials that could be used to verify whether the employee committed the alleged crime.

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.^[1] 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.^[2]

^[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

09. What additional considerations apply when the investigation involves whistleblowing?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Evidence obtained in the context of an investigation must specify who provided it and the date it was provided. No retaliatory measures may be taken against the whistleblower for the act of whistleblowing.

In certain cases, the whistleblower report must be forwarded to the judicial authorities (eg, when there is an obligation to assist persons in imminent danger, for serious offences or a disclosure that a vulnerable person is in danger (ie, minors under 15 or a person who is unable to protect themselves)).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

Aside from the legal obligations imposed on the company when dealing with a whistleblower who is subject to the WPA as discussed in question 1, there are also practical considerations the company should keep in mind when dealing with a whistleblower, regardless of whether the whistleblower falls under the WPA.

For example, there have been instances where an employee who raised allegations filed a complaint with Korean authorities (such as the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission (ACRC) or the Labour Office) that the company took retaliatory action against the whistleblower. The company should carefully review the legal risks before taking action, such as personnel action or civil or criminal action, against an employee who raises allegations if that employee was also involved in the wrongdoing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

If an employee complains to his or her superiors about grievances or misconduct in the workplace and is subsequently dismissed, this may constitute an unlawful termination (article 336, Swiss Code of Obligations). However, the prerequisite for this is that the employee behaves in good faith, which is not the case if he or she is (partly) responsible for the grievance.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Interviewers, investigators, interviewees or any others involved in the investigation are often bound by a reinforced confidentiality obligation, particularly when the internal investigation is triggered by a whistleblower alert. In addition, every person that comes to know of the investigation, facts or people involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. Furthermore, investigators should specifically be trained for interviews and be reminded of their obligations relating to the investigation.

The investigators will need to determine the order of the tasks to be carried out in the investigation, as this will have a significant impact on confidentiality management. Should they start with the hearings or a

review of documents? The answer may depend on the subject matter of the investigation. It is advisable to first review the documentation before organising interviews, particularly to avoid the destruction of certain documents by employees acting in bad faith or by those wishing to erase the traces of alleged wrongdoing. Sometimes, however, it is possible to start with the interviews, especially in the case of harassment, as there may be no documents to review. If the decision is taken to conduct the documentation review after the interviews, it could be useful to ask the employees involved to sign a document stating that they must preserve and retain documents, meaning that if they delete or destroy documents, they would be acting against the company and in breach of the law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

It is general practice in Korea for a company to require interviewees to maintain confidentiality concerning a workplace investigation and instruct them that they are not permitted to discuss the matter under investigation with other employees, etc. If an employee violates this instruction, it may be possible for the company to take disciplinary action against them under the company's rules.

Further, the company or its employees who have engaged in an investigation for sexual harassment or workplace harassment in the workplace are obliged to maintain the confidentiality of the investigation. Failure to comply with such requirements may lead to an administrative fine from the Ministry of Employment and Labour for the company or its registered representative.

There may be some exceptions to the confidentiality obligation, such as when an employee is required by government authorities to provide relevant information in a parallel investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

Besides the employee's duty of performance (article 319, Swiss Code of Obligations), the employment relationship is defined by the employer's duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and the employee's duty of loyalty (article 321a, Swiss Code of Obligations). Ancillary duties can be derived from the two duties, which are of importance for the confidentiality of an internal investigation.[\[1\]](#)

In principle, the employer must respect and protect the personality (including confidentiality and privacy) and integrity of the employee (article 328 paragraph 1, Swiss Code of Obligations) and take appropriate measures to protect the employee. Because of the danger of pre-judgment or damage to reputation as well as other adverse consequences, the employer must conduct an internal investigation discreetly and objectively. The limits of the duty of care are found in the legitimate self-interest of the employer.[\[2\]](#)

In return for the employer's duty of care, employees must comply with their duty of loyalty and safeguard the employer's legitimate interests. In connection with an internal investigation, employees must therefore keep the conduct of an investigation confidential. Additionally, employees must keep confidential and not disclose to any third party any facts that they have acquired in the course of the employment relationship, and which are neither obvious nor publicly accessible.[\[3\]](#)

[1] Wolfgang Portmann/Roger Rudolph, BSK OR, Art. 328 N 1 et seq.

[2] Claudia Fritsche, Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 202.

[3] David Rosenthal et al., Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 133.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

According to the French data protection authority, the employee under investigation must be informed of the name of the person in charge of the investigation, the alleged facts that have led to the whistleblowing alert and their rights to access and rectify data collected about them. This information must be given as soon as the data collection starts, before the interviews, as per GDPR principles.

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 requirement to notify an employee under investigation concerning the allegations against him or her when requesting cooperation with a workplace investigation (eg, requesting the employee's consent to review electronic data, or requesting an interview).

However, the company may strategically consider explaining the general purpose of the investigation before requesting consent to review electronic data or when requesting an interview. This may help increase the likelihood of cooperation and also reduce the risk of the employee raising objections to the company's findings from the investigation by saying he or she was not properly informed of the purpose of the investigation, or that the investigation was conducted in a coercive manner.

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

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



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The identity of the complainant must be kept confidential and cannot be disclosed. There are two exceptions: if the complainant consents to the disclosure; or if the employer is asked for this information by

the judicial authorities.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

As discussed in question 1, if the whistleblower falls under the WPA, the whistleblower's identity should be kept confidential. Even if the WPA does not apply, the company may wish to keep the identity of the whistleblower and other key witnesses confidential to the greatest extent possible.

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's 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.^[1]

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022

13. Can non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) be used to keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*

at Bredin Prat

Most of the time, the legal protection afforded by the legally prescribed confidentiality obligation that applies to whistleblowing is sufficient. This is all the more so given every person involved is bound by an obligation of discretion. However, there is no legal obstacle to the creation of an NDA between the employer and the people involved.

NDAs setting out a strict and reinforced obligation of confidentiality and discretion during the investigation should be signed by any external parties involved (eg, translation agency, IT expert) or when the internal investigation is outside the scope of whistleblowing regulations.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

Some companies require an employee subject to investigation to sign an NDA or other similar documents (eg, a pledge of confidentiality) agreeing not to disclose information relating to the investigation to outside parties.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

In addition to the above-mentioned statutory confidentiality obligations, separate non-disclosure agreements can be signed. In an internal investigation, the employee should be expressly instructed to maintain confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Privilege does not generally apply to internal investigation materials as the investigation does not constitute a relationship between a lawyer and their client, and even less so a judicial investigation. However, if a lawyer is appointed as an investigator, privilege may apply to materials exchanged between the lawyer and that client.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

No law recognises the common law concept of “attorney-client privilege” in Korea. However, communication with an attorney is protected to some extent under certain laws, such as the Constitution, the Attorney Act, the Criminal Procedure Act, and the Civil Procedure Act. This protection is based on the attorney’s confidentiality obligation, which prohibits an attorney from divulging confidential matters acquired in the course of representing clients, unless otherwise prescribed by law. This confidentiality obligation generally allows an attorney to refuse to testify or comply with document production orders for information or materials the attorney obtained in the course of his or her duties that relate to the confidential information of clients.

In addition, there could be instances where materials from an investigation conducted in Korea may become subject to discovery outside of Korea. It is, therefore, important to ensure investigation materials are privileged under the relevant non-Korean laws in the jurisdictions where attorney-client privilege is recognised (eg, the US).

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

As outlined above, all employees generally have the right to know whether and what personal data is being or has been processed about them (article 8 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection; article 328b, Swiss Code of Obligations).

The employer may refuse, restrict or postpone the disclosure or inspection of internal investigation documents if a legal statute so provides, if such action is necessary because of overriding third-party interests (article 9 paragraph 1, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection) or if the request for information is manifestly unfounded or malicious. Furthermore, a restriction is possible if overriding the self-interests of the responsible company requires such a measure and it also does not disclose the personal data to third parties. The employer or responsible party must justify its decision (article 9 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection).^[1]

The scope of the disclosure of information must, therefore, be determined by carefully weighing the interests of all parties involved in the internal investigation.

^[1] Claudia M. Fritsche, *Interne Untersuchungen in der Schweiz*, Ein Handbuch für Unternehmen mit besonderem Fokus auf Finanzinstitute, p. 284 et seq.

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?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation has the right to be assisted by a lawyer during the interviews and, if the employee chooses to be so, the lawyer must also always be present. The employee may not, however, be accompanied by anyone other than a legal representative (ie, another employee cannot attend the interview).

Last updated on 27/11/2023

South Korea

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

While the company cannot prevent an employee from engaging his or her legal counsel, there is no legal obligation for a company to allow an employee to bring his or her legal counsel to an interview, for example. If the employee expresses his or her intention not to participate in the interview session without his or her legal counsel, the company may consider explaining to the employee that such refusal to participate in the interview may constitute a breach of reasonable work-related orders and may be subject to disciplinary action. However, the company should consider the possibility of the employee claiming that he or she was not given a proper opportunity to explain the allegations during the investigation because they were prevented from obtaining legal assistance.

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:

16. If there is a works council or trade union, does it have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Neither the works council nor the trade unions have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation. It is the employer who is responsible for carrying out the investigation. However, when the investigation is triggered due to a works council issuing an alert relating in particular to a “serious and imminent danger”, one member of the works council must be involved in the investigation process.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

While a labour union does not have a legal right under Korean law to be informed or involved in the investigation, unless otherwise required under the relevant collective bargaining agreement, there have been instances where the labour union raised complaints that the company did not properly investigate an employee, who is a member of the labour union, particularly if the company took disciplinary action against that employee based on the findings of the investigation. The company should consider such a practical risk when conducting a workplace investigation.

If the investigation was conducted based on a claim filed by an employee to the Grievance Handling Committee (which is a sub-committee of a works council), the members of that committee have a right to be informed of the results of the investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

In general, works councils and trade unions are not very common in Switzerland and there are no statutory rules that would provide a works council or trade union a right to be informed or involved in an ongoing internal investigation. However, respective obligations might be foreseen in an applicable collective bargaining agreement, internal regulations or similar.

17. What other support can employees involved in the investigation be given?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Apart from being informed of any facts and data concerning them being collected during the investigation, employees involved in the investigation do not have any specific rights. Some companies choose to use external firms specializing in psychosocial risk management, not only to conduct internal investigations, but also to provide additional psychological support for their employees, as part of the employer's safety obligation.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

South Korea

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

There could be some instances where an employee involved in an investigation may be entitled to support from the company. To give an example, there have been some cases where a whistleblower claimed they suffered workplace harassment or their employer took retaliatory action (eg, wrongful transfer) and they sought damages or other relief.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The employer does not generally need to provide specific support for employees that are subject to an internal investigation. The employer may, however, allow concerned employees to be accompanied by a trusted third party such as family members or friends.^[1] These third parties will need to sign separate non-disclosure agreements before being involved in the internal investigation.

In addition, a company may appoint a so-called lawyer of confidence who has been approved by the employer and is thus subject to professional secrecy. This lawyer will not be involved in the internal investigation but may look after the concerned employees and give them confidential advice as well as inform them about their rights and obligations arising from the employment relationship.^[2]

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

^[2] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01,

18. What if unrelated matters are revealed as a result of the investigation?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Unrelated matters revealed during the investigation do not necessarily mean that another investigation will be opened. Nevertheless, if reprehensible acts unrelated to the current investigation are revealed, the employer will need to take action and sanction the perpetrator (after checking the facts). Sometimes the only way to check the facts is to carry out another investigation on a separate matter. However, the investigation team may also consider if there is enough connection between the matters to widen the scope of the current internal investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

Sometimes, the company discovers other potential misconduct in addition to the specific allegations that trigger a workplace investigation. No law limits the scope of the company's investigation to the allegations that were initially raised.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

There are no regulations in this regard in the Swiss employment law framework. However, in criminal proceedings, the rules regarding accidental findings apply (eg, article 243, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for searches and examinations or article 278, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code for surveillance of post and telecommunications). In principle, accidental findings are usable, with the caveat of general prohibitions on the use of evidence.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

19. What if the employee under investigation raises a grievance during the investigation?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The grievance may also have to be investigated (eg, moral/sexual harassment reported by an employee under investigation).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

South Korea

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

It is not uncommon for an employee under investigation to raise grievances during or after the investigation. Below are some examples of claims an employee may raise:

- that the company reviewed the employee's electronic data without obtaining the requisite consent;
- that witnesses or the company committed defamation in violation of the Criminal Code;
- that the employee was coerced to comply with the investigation in violation of the Criminal Code;
- that the employee was disciplined without just cause; or
- that the employee was harassed by other employees for providing information during the investigation.

The actions the company should take would vary depending on the grievance raised.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer


In the context of private internal investigations, grievances initially raised by the employee do not usually have an impact on the investigation.

However, if the employer terminates the employment contract due to a justified legal complaint raised by an employee, a court might consider the termination to be abusive and award the employee compensation in an amount to be determined by the court but not exceeding six months' pay for the employee (article 336 paragraph 1 (lit. b) and article 337c paragraph 3, Swiss Code of Obligations). Furthermore, a termination by the employer may be challenged if it takes place without good cause following a complaint of discrimination by the employee to a superior or the initiation of proceedings before a conciliation board or a court by the employee (article 10, Federal Act on Gender Equality).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off sick during the investigation?

France

 Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The investigation will likely be able to continue with the other employees and, as soon as the employee under investigation returns from sick leave, they will be able to be interviewed.

However, as disciplinary sanctions are time-barred after two months from the moment the misconduct was committed or from when the employer becomes aware of it, if the sick leave lasts for the whole of that period, the investigation must be conducted anyway. In this instance, the investigator can ask the employee to attend the interview despite being on sick leave or arrange for the interview to take place using other means (eg, conference call). As a last resort, a questionnaire can be sent to the employee, but the pros and cons must be assessed as this is a way of information gathering that carries a certain amount of risk, could be less reliable and is of less probative value.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

South Korea

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

The company should review whether the employee under investigation is requesting sick leave under appropriate procedures and for a legitimate reason and may consider ways to persuade the employee to cooperate with the investigation. If the employee applies for sick leave following company policy, the company would need to grant such sick leave and suspend the investigation during the sick leave.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

The time spent on the internal investigation by the employee should be counted as working time^[1]. The general statutory and internal company principles on sick leave apply. Sick leave for which the respective employee is not responsible must generally be compensated (article 324a paragraph 1 and article 324b, Swiss Code of Obligations). During certain periods of sick leave (blocking period), the employer may not ordinarily terminate the employment contract; however, immediate termination for cause remains possible.

The duration of the blocking period depends on the employee's seniority, amounting to 30 days in the employee's first year of service, 90 days in the employee's second to ninth year of service and 180 days thereafter (article 336c paragraph 1 (lit. c), Swiss Code of Obligations).

^[1] Ullin Streiff/Adrian von Kaenel/Roger Rudolph, Arbeitsvertrag, Praxiskommentar zu Art. 319–362 OR, 7. A. 2012, Art. 328b N 8 OR.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

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

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



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employee under investigation, like the other employees interviewed and the whistleblower, must be informed that the investigation has been completed. However, there is no obligation to provide them with the report and, for reasons of confidentiality, it is very often best not to do so.

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 legal obligation for a company to disclose the outcome of an investigation to the employee who was subject to it. Having said that, if the company wishes to take disciplinary action against the employee based on the outcome of an investigation, it is required to disclose sufficient detail on the employee's wrongdoing that is subject to disciplinary action. This information should be provided to the employee before the disciplinary action committee (DAC) hearing to provide the employee with sufficient time to present and defend his or her position during the DAC hearing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

Workplace investigations often result in an investigation report that is intended to serve as the basis for any measures to be taken by the company's decisionmakers.

The employee's right to information based on article 8, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection also covers the investigation report, provided that the report and the data contained therein relate to the employee.^[1] In principle, the employee concerned is entitled to receive a written copy of the entire investigation report free of charge (article 8 paragraph 5, Swiss Federal Act on Data Protection and article 1 et seq, Ordinance to the Federal Act on Data Protection). Redactions may be made where the interests of the company or third parties so require, but they are the exception and must be kept to a minimum.^[2]

[1] Arbeitsgericht Zürich, Entscheide 2013 No. 16; Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 393 et seq.

[2] Roger Rudolph, Interne Untersuchungen: Spannungsfelder aus arbeitsrechtlicher Sicht, SJZ 114/2018, p. 394.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

23. Should the investigation report be shared in full, or just the findings?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

There is no obligation to share the investigation report. The findings, or a summary of them without revealing any confidential information, may be disclosed, but it is the employer's responsibility to keep the identity of every person interviewed confidential.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

As discussed in question 22, when taking disciplinary action against an employee based on the outcome of an investigation, the company would need to disclose sufficient detail on the employee's wrongdoing. However, this does not mean that the full investigation report would need to be shared with the employee to be disciplined. Key details of the investigation findings that apply to the relevant employee due to be disciplined should be shared, and not other findings concerning other persons.

There is also no requirement under Korean law for a company to disclose the investigation report or investigation findings to the whistleblower. If the company discloses the personal identity of the target employees, such disclosure could constitute a violation of the PIPA, libel or defamation under the Criminal Code. If the whistleblower strongly requests that the company share the investigation report or the findings, the company may consider providing a summary of the key findings concerning the allegations that the whistleblower raised, without disclosing personal information.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

In principle, there is no obligation to disclose the final investigation report. Disclosure obligations may arise based on data protection law vis-à-vis the persons concerned (eg, the accused). Likewise, there is no obligation to disclose other documents, such as the records of interviews. The employee should be fully

informed of the final investigation report, if necessary, with certain redactions (see question 22). The right of the employee concerned to information is comprehensive (ie, all investigation files must be disclosed to him).[1] Regarding publication to other bodies outside of criminal proceedings, the employer is bound by its duty of care (article 328, Swiss Code of Obligations) and must protect the employee as far as is possible and reasonable.[2]

[1] Nicolas Facincani/Reto Sutter, *Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten*, in: HR Today, to be found on: <Interne Untersuchungen: Rechte und Pflichten von Arbeitgebern und Angestellten | hrtoday.ch> (last visited on 27 June 2022).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

24. What next steps are available to the employer?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The employer can decide to sanction the person who was under investigation or to close the case. The employer may also need to protect any victims, witnesses and whistleblowers. If, during the investigation, it is discovered that a supplier or other commercial partner is implicated, the relevant contract may be terminated. The employer can take legal action, file a complaint (if the company is a direct victim of a criminal offence) or report the offence to the public prosecutor's office. The employer must archive the file or ensure its lawful preservation after a certain period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

After completing an investigation, the company may consider the following measures, among others:

1. taking disciplinary action against the relevant employees;
2. taking legal action (eg, criminal action, civil action) against the relevant employees; and
3. taking appropriate remedial measures (eg, strengthening existing policies and establishing new policies, and conducting training).

The company may also consider making a voluntary report to the relevant authorities as discussed in question 25.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

If the investigation uncovers misconduct, the question arises as to what steps should be taken. Of course, the severity of the misconduct and the damage caused play a significant role. Furthermore, it must be noted that the cooperation of the employee concerned may be of decisive importance for the outcome of the investigation. The possibilities are numerous, ranging, for example, from preventive measures to criminal complaints.^[1]

If individual disciplinary actions are necessary, these may range from warnings to ordinary or immediate termination of employment.

^[1] David Rosenthal et al., *Praxishandbuch für interne Untersuchungen und eDiscovery*, Release 1.01, Zürich/Bern 2021, p. 180 et seq.

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?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

The findings must be submitted to the employer or management, but there is no obligation to disclose them to anybody else. The only exception is if a judicial investigation has been opened. In this case, the entire report must be provided to the authorities if the judge requests this. Normally the investigators only take written notes and there is no audio or video recording, unless the employee consents. Whether or not to make a voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing is a tactical decision for companies. Disclosure may mitigate fines and penalties or even help the employer avoid liability entirely. However, the downsides of disclosure include increased costs, the possibility of a follow-on government investigation and exposure to penalties. Thus, most companies assess their options on a case-by-case basis to determine what steps would be in the best interests of the company.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



South Korea

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

There is generally no obligation to report violations to the Korean authorities, subject to limited exceptions (eg, financial institutions are required to report certain types of wrongdoing to the financial regulator; if there was a leak of an industrial technology developed through a national research and development project or a national core technology, this leak should be reported to the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Energy and the National Intelligence Service). However, even in the absence of a self-reporting obligation, the company may consider strategically deciding to make a voluntary report. For example, there have been

instances where the police or prosecutors' investigations were conducted in a more limited manner where the company filed a voluntary report and cooperated with the investigation. Also, for certain types of violations (eg, cartel activities), self-reporting to the relevant authority may entitle the company to leniency provided under the law.

In certain instances, the company may also consider reporting violations to the relevant foreign authorities, in addition to, or instead of, the Korean authorities. For example, if the company found potential violations of US law such as sanctions law or the Foreign Corrupt Practice Act, the company may want to self-report these violations to the relevant authorities such as the Office of Foreign Assets Control, or the US Department of Justice.

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.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

26. How long should the outcome of the investigation remain on the employee's record?

France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

If the outcome of the internal investigation has led to the sanctioning of an employee, this sanction may no longer be invoked to support a new sanction after three years. Moreover, under the GDPR principles, the duration of retention must be proportional to the use of the data. Therefore, the data must be retained only for a period that is "strictly necessary and proportionate". If the employer wants to keep information about the investigation in the longer term, it is possible to archive the employee's record even though the employer will no longer be able to use it against the employee after three years.

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 legal requirement on how long the records of the investigation (eg disciplinary action) should be maintained by the company. Many companies maintain a record of disciplinary action throughout the employment period.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

From an employment law point of view, there is no statute of limitations on the employee's violations. Based on the specific circumstances (eg, damage incurred, type of violation, basis of trust or the position of the employee), a decision must be made as to the extent to which the outcome should remain on the record.

From a data protection point of view, only data that is in the interest of the employee (eg, to issue a reference letter) may be retained during the employment relationship. In principle, stored data must be deleted after the termination of the employment relationship. Longer retention may be justified if rights are still to be safeguarded or obligations are to be fulfilled in the future (eg, data needed regarding foreseeable legal proceedings, data required to issue a reference letter or data in relation to a non-competition clause).^[1]

^[1] Wolfgang Portmann/Isabelle Wildhaber, *Schweizerisches Arbeitsrecht*, 4. Edition, Zurich/St. Gallen 2020, N 473.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

27. What legal exposure could the employer face for errors during the investigation?



France

Author: *Pascale Lagesse, Valentino Armillei*
at Bredin Prat

Within the context of an investigation following a whistleblower alert, any violation of the confidentiality obligation is punishable by two years' imprisonment and a €30,000 fine.

If the employer fails to comply with its obligation to protect its employees' safety, the employer will be liable for damages resulting from any failings during the investigation (eg, if sexual harassment is reported and no action is taken by the employer)



South Korea

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

As mentioned in question 19, employees may potentially raise claims, such as that the company violated data privacy laws in reviewing employee data, committed defamation, coerced the employee to comply with the investigation, and that witnesses or the company committed defamation in violation of the Criminal Code or disciplined the employee without just cause.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



Switzerland

Author: *Laura Widmer, Sandra Schaffner*
at Bär & Karrer

As there are no specific regulations for internal investigations, the usual legal framework within which the employer must act towards the employee derives from general rules such as the employer's duty of care, the employee's duty of loyalty and the employee's data protection rights.

But, for example, unwarranted surveillance could conceivably result in criminal liability (article 179 et seq, Swiss Criminal Code) for violations of the employee's privacy. Furthermore, errors made by the employer could have an impact on any later criminal proceedings (eg, in the form of prohibitions on the use of evidence).[1]

Evidence obtained unlawfully may only be used in civil proceedings if there is an overriding interest in establishing the truth (article 152 paragraph 2, Swiss Civil Procedure Code). Consequently, in each case, a balance must be struck between the individual's interest in not using the evidence and in establishing the truth.[2] The question of the admissibility of evidence based on an unlawful invasion of privacy is a sensitive one – admissibility in this case is likely to be accepted only with restraint.[3] Since the parties in civil proceedings do not have any means of coercion at their disposal, it is not necessary, in contrast to criminal proceedings, to examine whether the evidence could also have been obtained by legal means.[4]

Unlawful action by the employer may also have consequences on future criminal proceedings: The prohibitions on exploitation (article 140 et seq, Swiss Criminal Procedure Code) apply a priori only to evidence obtained directly from public authorities. Evidence obtained unlawfully by private persons (ie, the employer) may also be used if it could have been lawfully obtained by the authority and if the interest in establishing the truth outweighs the interest of the individual in not using the evidence.[5] Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code remains reserved: Evidence obtained in violation of Art. 140 paragraph 1 Swiss Criminal Procure Code is subject to an absolute ban on the use of evidence (e.g. evidence obtained under the use of torture[6]).[7]

[1] Cf. ATF 139 II 7.

[2] ATF 140 III 6 E. 3

[3] Pascal Grolimund in: Adrian Staehelin/Daniel Staehelin/Pascal Grolimund (editors), *Zivilprozessrecht*, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2019, 3rd Edition, §18 N 24a.

[4] Pascal Grolimund in: Adrian Staehelin/Daniel Staehelin/Pascal Grolimund (editors), *Zivilprozessrecht*, Zurich/Basel/Geneva 2019, 3rd Edition, §18 N 24a.

[5] Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 6B_1241/2016 dated 17. July 2017 consid. 1.2.2; Decision of the Swiss Federal Court 1B_22/2012 dated 11 May 2012 consid. 2.4.4.

[6] Jérôme Benedict/Jean Treccani, CR-CPP Art. 140 N. 5 and Art. 141 N. 3.

[7] Yvan Jeanneret/André Kuhn, Précis de procédure pénale, 2nd Edition, Berne 2018, N 9011.

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