

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

02. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?



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

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



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).

Contributors



South Korea

Hyunjae Park

Paul Cho

Jihay Ellie Kwack

Kyson Keebong Paek

Kim & Chang



Switzerland

Laura Widmer

Sandra Schaffner

Bär & Karrer