

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

06. Can co-workers be compelled to act as witnesses? What legal protections do employees have when acting as witnesses in an investigation?



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

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



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.

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?



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 Romero/Claudio Bazzani

(Hrsg.), Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 123.

[2] Oliver Thormann, Sicht der Strafverfolger – Chancen und Risiken, in: Flavio Romero/Claudio Bazzani (Hrsg.), Interne und regulatorische Untersuchungen, Zürich/Basel/Genf 2016, p. 102 et seq.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

Contributors



South Korea

Hyunjae Park

Paul Cho

Jihay Ellie Kwack

Kyson Keebong Paek

Kim & Chang



Switzerland

Laura Widmer

Sandra Schaffner

Bär & Karrer

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com