

Workplace Investigations

Contributing Editors

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

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?



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

Contributors



South Korea

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



Switzerland

Laura Widmer
Sandra Schaffner
Bär & Karrer