

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

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

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

year.

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

Last updated on 15/09/2022



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

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



Hong Kong

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

Where there is a parallel criminal or regulatory investigation, the employer should handle the workplace investigation with extra care and ensure that it complies with all applicable legal requirements or lawful requests made by the relevant authorities concurrently. While there may be reasons why the employer wants to progress with its investigation as soon as possible, the employer should not take any steps that

hinder or obstruct the parallel investigations. Therefore, it may be appropriate for the employer to stay its workplace investigation if its continuation may prejudice the parallel investigations.

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

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

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

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

Last updated on 27/11/2023

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



Hong Kong

Wynne Mok

Jason Cheng
Audrey Li
Slaughter and May



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com