

# Workplace Investigations

## Contributing Editors

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

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

### Australia

Author: *Joydeep Hor, Kirryn West James, Chris Oliver*  
at People + Culture Strategies

A complaint will be a whistleblowing complaint where a complainant has reasonable grounds to suspect that the information they are disclosing about the organisation concerns misconduct or an improper state of affairs or circumstances. The information can be about the organisation or an officer or employee of the organisation engaging in conduct that:

- breaches the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth);
- breaches other financial sector laws;
- breaches any other law punishable by 12 months' imprisonment; or
- represents a danger to the public or the financial system.

Since 2020, all public companies, large proprietary companies and trustees of registrable superannuation entities in Australia are required to have a whistleblower policy. Employers conducting an investigation will need to follow the processes outlined in their policy.

One of the key differences when conducting an investigation that involves whistleblowing is identity protection and the ability of the whistleblower to disclose anonymously and remain anonymous.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

### Austria

Author: *Michaela Gerlach, Sonia Ben Brahim*  
at GERLACH

The provisions of the Whistleblowing Directive must be respected. In Austria, these have been implemented through the Whistleblower Protection Act (HSchG). If the whistleblower or the persons concerned fall within the scope of the Directive, their identity must be protected. Only authorised persons may access the report. Retaliatory measures are invalid or must be reversed. Within a maximum of seven days, the whistleblower must receive a confirmation of his or her complaint. Feedback to the whistleblower must then be provided within a maximum of three months.

## Belgium

Author: *Nicolas Simon*  
at Van Olmen & Wynant

If the investigation is based on a whistleblower report that falls under the scope of the upcoming rules, the investigators are bound by a strict duty of confidentiality, especially regarding the identity of the report. The rules also provide some procedural deadlines for feeding back to the reporter. Within seven days of receiving the report through an internal reporting channel, the reporting manager needs to send a receipt to the whistleblower. From that moment, the reporting manager has three months to investigate the report and give feedback and an adequate follow-up to the report. Next, the rules offer strong protection against any retaliatory measures the reporter may experience. Regardless, these rules are mostly intended to offer the necessary protection for whistleblowers and to ensure that companies take necessary investigative steps following a report, but they do not include much information about the actual procedure of the investigation besides certain deadlines, nor do they deal with other employees involved (or under investigation).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Brazil

Author: *Patricia Barboza, Maury Lobo*  
at CGM

If the investigation involves matters within the scope of a specific whistleblowing policy, the policy rules should prevail against the general investigation rules if there is a conflict.

Last updated on 14/09/2023

## China

Author: *Leo Yu, Yvonne Gao, Tracy Liu, Larry Lian*  
at Jingtian & Gongcheng

In practice, the following factors to be considered will be: (1) verification of the informant's identity; (2) whether the informant has any conflict of interest with the reported employee or whether it will affect the objectivity of their reporting; (3) how to persuade the informant to provide more information or evidence, or to cooperate in court as a witness; (4) how to increase the admissibility of evidence when the informant refuses to cooperate in court as a witness or fails to provide original evidence; (5) how to improve the evidence chain and protect the informant from being attacked or retaliated by the informant, etc.

Last updated on 29/11/2023

## Finland

Author: *Anu Waaralinna, Mari Mohsen*  
at Roschier

In respect of data protection, the processing of personal data in whistleblowing systems is considered by

the Finnish Data Protection Ombudsman (DPO) as requiring a data protection impact assessment (DPIA).

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## 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

## Germany

Author: *Hendrik Bockenheimer, Susanne Walzer, Musa Müjdecı*  
at Hengeler Mueller

In 2023, Germany has implemented the EU Whistleblowing Directive into national law with the German Whistleblower Protection Act (HinSchG).

The German Whistleblower Protection Act provides that companies with at least 50 employees must establish internal reporting channels as further set out in the law. Among other things, the confidentiality of the whistleblower as well as of the individuals affected by the report must be protected.

Further, whistleblowers must be protected from negative consequences that may arise from their reports. If the employment of a whistleblower were terminated or if the whistleblower were to be denied promotion after reporting a violation, the employer would have to prove that this was not related to the whistleblowing but was based on justified reasons.

Employers should familiarise themselves with the provisions of the new law.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Greece

Author: *Angeliki Tsatsi, Anna Pechlivanidi, Pinelopi Anyfanti, Katerina Basta*  
at Karatzas & Partners

L. 4990/2022 includes specific requirements regarding, among other things, the procedure of receiving and investigating respective reports, confidentiality issues (especially regarding the identity of the whistleblower), data protection issues (including restrictions to the right of access) and the employer's right to keep a record of the relevant complaint and investigation. Such provisions are expected to be further detailed by Ministerial Decisions in future.

Last updated on 03/04/2023

## Hong Kong

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

Hong Kong does not have a comprehensive legislative framework relating to whistleblowing. Therefore, in general, employers are free to establish whistleblowing policies and procedures and confer such protections on whistleblowers as they see fit. That said, companies listed on the Main Board of the SEHK are expected to establish a whistleblowing policy and system for employees to voice concerns anonymously about possible improprieties in the companies' affairs. If a listed issuer deviates from this practice, it must explain the deviation.<sup>[1]</sup>

When an investigation involves whistleblowing, the employer needs to comply with the relevant policy and system and provide the whistleblower with such protections as stated in the policy. The employer should not ignore a complaint simply because it was made anonymously, and should ascertain the substance of the complaint to decide whether a full-blown investigation is warranted.

In addition, the employer should seek to establish a secure communication channel with the whistleblower to gather more information about the complaint or misconduct while maintaining the confidentiality of his or her identity. If the complaint is serious, the employer may consider referring the complaint to a law enforcement agency or regulator as they would be better placed in protecting the anonymity of the whistleblower while proceeding with the investigation. That said, employers generally have no obligation to report internal wrongdoing to any external body (please see question 25 for exceptions). The employer may assess whether it is appropriate to do so on a case-by-case basis.

---

[1] The Corporate Governance Code, Appendix 14 of the Rules Governing the Listing of Securities on the Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited.

Last updated on 27/11/2023



## India

Author: *Atul Gupta, Kanishka Maggon, Kopal Kumar*  
at Trilegal

Indian labour legislation does not stipulate any additional considerations or requirements concerning whistleblower complaints in private organisations and these are only available if there are complaints against public servants. Further, under the Companies Act, 2013, certain companies are required to establish a "vigil mechanism" for directors and employees to report genuine concerns regarding the affairs of the company. The vigil mechanism should provide adequate safeguards against the victimisation of persons using it.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Ireland

Author: *Bláthnaid Evans, Mary Gavin*  
at Ogier

Most whistleblowing policies will include a section that provides for an initial assessment of the complaint as to whether it meets the definition of a protected disclosure. This assessment, which ought to be carried out by a designated person who has been appointed to deal with disclosures, is a useful tool as some matters which may be labelled as whistleblowing may fall under the grievance procedure.

Where there are grounds, an investigation will be commenced. Under the Protected Disclosures (Amendment) Act 2022, whistleblowers are protected from penalisation for having made a protected

disclosure, under the Act.

Penalisation may include; suspension, lay-off or dismissal; demotion, loss of opportunity for promotion or withholding of promotion; transfer of duties, change of location or place of work; reduction in wages or change in working hours; the imposition or administering of any discipline, reprimand or other penalty (including a financial penalty); coercion, intimidation, harassment or ostracism; or discrimination, disadvantage or unfair treatment.

If an employee (which includes trainees, volunteers, and job applicants) alleges that they have suffered penalisation as a result of making a protected disclosure, they may apply to the Circuit Court for interim relief within 21 days of the date of the last act of penalisation by the employer.

A claim for penalisation may also be brought before the WRC within six months of the alleged act of penalisation. If an employee alleges that they were dismissed for having made a protected disclosure, the potential award that the WRC can make increases from the usual unfair dismissal cap of two years' pay to up to five years' gross pay, based on actual loss.

Where a complaint of whistleblowing is made, employers should ensure that they appoint investigators with the appropriate knowledge and expertise to deal with such a matter and comply with the time limits set by legislation.

Last updated on 11/10/2023

## Italy

Author: *Giovanni Muzina, Arianna Colombo*  
at BonelliErede

The regulations on whistleblowing in the private sector were originally outlined in article 6 of Italian Legislative Decree No. 231 of 2001 (as amended by Law No. 179 of 2017), which state that the models of organisation must provide for one or more channels that allow persons in positions of representation, administration and management of the entity (and persons subject to their direction or supervision) to report unlawful conduct according to Italian Legislative Decree No. 231 of 2001 and violations of the entity's organisational and management rules.

Currently, Italy has implemented Directive (EU) No. 1937 of 2019, which provides for the adoption of new standards of protection for whistleblowers, through the Italian Legislative Decree No. 24 of 2023 (WB Decree)[1].

In line with the Directive, the WB Decree states, inter alia, that[2]:

- an internal whistleblowing reporting channel must be put in place by all private legal entities (and legal entities in the public sector) that have employed, during the previous year, an average of 50 employees or, even below this threshold, operate in certain industries[3] or have adopted an organizational model in accordance with Legislative Decree no. 231 of 2001;
- the WB Decree prescriptions apply to reports concerning breaches of certain national/EU[4] legal provisions (varying depending on features such as the private or public nature of the employer and its dimensions), and not to claims or requests linked to interests of a personal nature of the reporting individuals (pertaining to their individual employment contracts or to relations with their superiors)[5];
- whistleblowers' reporting may take place through:
  - the company's internal reporting channels and internal reporting procedures (with the possibility – for entities employing up to 249 employees, even if not part of the same group – to share whistleblowing reporting channels); or
  - external reporting channels and external reporting procedures established by the member states' competent authorities (in Italy, ANAC, i.e. the National Anticorruption Authority); or
  - in certain circumstances, public disclosure;
- whistleblowing systems must provide:
  - a duty of confidentiality regarding the whistleblowers' identity (which generally may not be

- disclosed to persons other than those competent to receive or investigate on the reports, except in specific case and with the whistleblower's consent; see also answer to question 12 below); and
- ways of protecting collected data according to the GDPR, as well as tight deadlines for communication with whistleblowers<sup>[6]</sup>; and
- an integrated system of protection of whistleblowers against any retaliatory action directly or indirectly linked to their reports or declarations, with a reversal of the burden of proof (meaning the employer must give proof of the non-retaliatory nature of measures adopted vis-à-vis whistleblowers); and
- the procedures to be taken in case of anonymous whistleblowing report.

---

[1] The provisions of the Decree are binding since July 15, 2023, for larger companies, and as of Dec. 17, 2023, for entities employing an average of from 50 to 249 employees.

[2] This is only a brief and non-exhaustive summary of some of the main provisions under the WB Decree.

[3] In particular, companies that fall within the scope of application of EU acts listed in Annex (part I.B and II) of the WB Decree (for instance, financial services, products and markets; money laundering/terrorism prevention; transportation security; etc.)

[4] Listed in art. 2 and in Annex 1 of the WB Decree (for instance, regarding financial services, products and markets sector) or protecting the EU financial interests or internal market.

[5] Listed in art. 2 and in Annex 1 of the WB Decree (for instance, regarding financial services, products and markets sector) or protecting the EU financial interests or internal market.

[6] In greater detail: (i) a notice acknowledging the receipt of the WB report must be released within seven days; (ii) contacts must be kept with the whistleblower for any additions needed (if the identity is known); and (iii) within three months of the notice of receipt of the report, a follow-up notice must be given to the whistleblower (which may also be non-definitive, with a status update on activities in progress).

Last updated on 10/01/2024



## Japan

Author: *Chisako Takaya*  
at Mori Hamada & Matsumoto

See question 4 regarding amendments to the Whistleblower Protection Act.

The person designated as a whistleblower response service employee must not divulge the name, employee ID number, or other information that would allow a whistleblower to be identified without a justifiable reason, and there is a criminal penalty of up to 300,000 yen for violating this duty of confidentiality.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Netherlands

Author: *Barbara Kloppert, Mirjam Kerkhof, Roel de Jong*  
at De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek

The former Act on the House for Whistleblowers already provided for several preconditions that a whistleblowing procedure must meet. For example, internal reporting lines must be laid down, as well as how the internal report is handled, and an obligation of confidentiality and the opportunity to consult an advisor in confidence must be applied. Employers are obliged to share the whistleblowing policy with employees, including information about the employee's legal protection. The employee who reports a

suspicion of wrongdoing in good faith may not be disadvantaged in their legal position because of the report (section 17e/ea Act House of Whistleblowers).

The starting point is that an employee must first report internally, unless this cannot reasonably be expected. If the employee does not report internally first, the House for Whistleblowers does not initiate an investigation. The House for Whistleblowers was established on 1 July 2016 and has two main tasks: advising employees on the steps to take and conducting an investigation in response to a report.

The Act on the Protection of Whistleblowers, which entered into force in 2023, introduced several changes, of which the most relevant are:

- Abolition of mandatory internal reporting: the obligation to report internally first is abolished. Direct external reporting is allowed, such as to the House for Whistleblowers or another competent authority. When reporting externally, the reporter retains his protection. However, reporting internally first remains preferable and will be encouraged by the employer as much as possible.
- Expansion of prohibition on detriment: the prohibition on detriment already included prejudicing the legal position of the reporter, such as suspension, dismissal, demotion, withholding of promotion, reduction of salary or change of work location. It now also includes all forms of disadvantage, such as being blacklisted, refusing to give a reference, bullying, intimidation and exclusion.
- Stricter time limit requirements for internal reporting: the reporter must receive an acknowledgement of receipt of the report within seven days and the reporter must receive information from the employer on the assessment of their report within a reasonable period, not exceeding three months.
- Extension of the circle of protected persons: not just employees, but third parties who are in a working relationship with the employer are now also protected, such as freelancers, interns, volunteers, suppliers, shareholders, job applicants and involved family members and colleagues.

Last updated on 27/11/2023

## Nigeria

Author: *Adekunle Obebe*  
at Bloomfield LP

Consideration must be given to the confidentiality or anonymity of the whistleblower, when an investigation involves whistleblowing.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Philippines

Author: *Rashel Ann C. Pomoy*  
at Villaraza & Angangco

Since there is no specific law that governs whistleblowing, matters that involve whistleblowing will be governed by company policy.

Last updated on 26/01/2023

## Poland

Author: *Wioleta Polak, Aleksandra Stępniewska, Julia Jewgraf*  
at WKB Lawyers

In principle, an internal investigation should be conducted in the same way, regardless of whether it is initiated following a whistleblowing report, an audit, or a monitoring result. This includes anything related to confidentiality, fairness, data privacy protection, etc.

If an internal investigation is initiated following a whistleblower report, the main characteristic that is imposed by the EU Directive on the protection of persons who report breaches of EU Law (Whistleblowers Directive) and that will also be available under the Draft Law is for the organisation (employer) to communicate (if practicable) the report to the whistleblower. Furthermore, the whistleblower should receive feedback as to whether follow-up actions were undertaken following the report and, if yes – what actions were taken – and if not – why the follow-up actions were not taken.

Last updated on 20/04/2023



## Portugal

Author: *André Pestana Nascimento*  
at Uría Menéndez - Proença de Carvalho

The treatment of whistleblowers and their reports is laid down in various specific laws in Portugal.

### **Law 93/2021**

Under Law 93/2021, a whistleblower of work-related offences must not be retaliated against. Furthermore, imposing disciplinary penalties on the whistleblower within two years after their disclosure is presumed to be abusive. The whistleblower is entitled to judicial protection and may benefit from the witness protection programme within criminal proceedings. Additionally, reports will be recorded for five years and, where applicable, personal data that is not relevant for the handling of a specific report will not be collected or, if accidentally collected, will be deleted immediately.

### **Corruption and Financial Crime Law (Law 19/2008)**

Under Law 19/2008, a whistleblower must not be hampered. Furthermore, the imposition of disciplinary penalties on a whistleblower within one year following the communication of the infraction is presumed to be unfair.

Additionally, whistleblowers are entitled to:

- anonymity until the pressing of charges;
- be transferred following the pressing of charges; and
- benefit from the witness protection programme within criminal proceedings (remaining anonymous upon the verification of specific circumstances).

### **Money Laundering and Terrorism Financing Law (Law 83/2017)**

Law 83/2017, which sets forth the legal framework to prevent, detect and effectively combat money laundering and terrorism financing, applies to financial entities and legal or natural persons acting in the exercise of their professional activities (eg, auditors and lawyers)(collectively, obliged entities).

According to article 20 of Law 83/2017, individuals who learn of any breach through their professional duties must report those breaches to the company's supervisory or management bodies. As a result, the obliged entities must refrain from threatening or taking hostile action against the whistleblower and, in particular, unfair treatment within the workplace. Specifically, the report cannot be used as grounds for disciplinary, civil or criminal action against the whistleblower (unless the communication is deliberately and clearly unjustified).

### **Legal Framework of Credit Institutions and Financial Companies (RGICSF)**

Credit institutions must implement internal-reporting mechanisms that must guarantee the confidentiality of the information received and the protection of the personal data of the persons reporting the breaches



and the persons charged. Under article 116-AA of RGICSF, persons who, while working in a credit institution, become aware of:

- any serious irregularities in the management, accounting procedures or internal control of the credit institution; or
- evidence of a breach of the duties set out in the RGICSF that may cause any financial imbalance, must communicate those circumstances to the company's supervisory body.

These communications cannot, per se, be used as grounds for disciplinary, criminal or civil liability actions brought by the credit institution against the whistleblower.

Moreover, article 116-AB of the RGICSF establishes that any person aware of compelling evidence of a breach of statutory duties may report it to the Bank of Portugal. Such communications cannot, per se, be used as grounds for disciplinary, criminal or civil liability actions brought by the credit institution against the whistleblower, unless the report is clearly unfounded.

The Bank of Portugal must ensure adequate protection of the person who has reported the breach and the person accused of breaching the applicable duties. It must also guarantee the confidentiality of the persons who have reported breaches at any given time.

### **Portuguese Securities Code (CVM)**

Article 382 of the CVM states that financial intermediaries subject to the supervision of the Portuguese Securities Market Commission (CMVM), judicial authorities, police authorities, or respective employees must immediately inform the CMVM if they become aware of facts that qualify as crimes against the securities market or the market of other financial instruments, due to their performance, activity, or position.

Additionally, according to article 368-A of the CVM, any person aware of facts, evidence, or information regarding administrative offences under the CVM or its supplementary regulations may report them to the CMVM either anonymously or with the whistleblower's identity. The disclosure of the whistleblower's identity, as well as that of their employer, is optional. If the report identifies the whistleblower, their identity cannot be disclosed unless specifically authorised by the whistleblower, by an express provision of law or by the determination of a court.

Such communications may not be used as grounds for disciplinary, criminal, or civil liability action brought against the whistleblower, and they may not be used to demote the employee.

According to article 368-E of the CVM, the CMVM must cooperate with other authorities within the scope of administrative or judicial proceedings to protect employees against employer discrimination, retaliation or any other form of unfair treatment by the employer that may be linked to the communication to the CMVM. The whistleblower may be entitled to benefit from the witness-protection programme if an individual is charged in criminal or administrative proceedings because of their communication to the CMVM.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## **Singapore**

Author: *Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Tan Ting Ting*  
at Rajah & Tann Singapore

Under the Prevention of Corruption Act 1960 and the Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes (Confiscation of Benefits) Act 1992 (CDSCA), in any civil or criminal proceeding, no witness is obliged to disclose the name or address of any informer, or disclose any information that might lead to his or her discovery concerning offences such as corruption, drug trafficking, and money laundering, save where:

- in any proceeding for the offence, the Court, after a full inquiry into the case, is of the opinion that the informer wilfully made, in his complaint, a material statement that he knew or believed to be false or did not believe to be true; or

- in any other proceeding, the court is of the opinion that justice cannot be fully done between the parties without the discovery of the informer.

In line with the above, employers should therefore keep the informer's identity confidential upon receiving a complaint relating to corruption, drug trafficking, money laundering, and other serious offences prescribed in the second schedule of the CDSCA.

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



## Spain

Author: *Sergio Ponce, Daniel Cerrutti*  
at Uría Menéndez

Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 23 October 2019, on the protection of persons who report breaches of Union law, has been implemented in Spain through Law 2/2023 (Ley 2/2023, de 20 de febrero, reguladora de la protección de las personas que informen sobre infracciones normativas y de lucha contra la corrupción). This law limits the capacity of companies to retaliate or to take any action against employees who report workplace violations or breaches of the law. Any action taken against an employee in such a position would be considered null and void if challenged in court.

Spanish law allows anonymous reports to protect whistleblowers from retaliation.

Last updated on 06/11/2023



## Sweden

Author: *Henric Diefke, Tobias Normann, Alexandra Baron*  
at Mannheimer Swartling

If the Swedish Whistleblowing Act governs the investigation, additional considerations apply relating to who may investigate a reported irregularity (see question 4) and the duty of confidentiality and restrictions on access to and disclosure of personal data in investigations (see questions 6, 10 and 11), as well as the rights and protections of whistleblowers.

As regards the rights and protections of whistleblowers, the following can be noted. A person reporting in a

reporting channel governed by the Swedish Whistleblowing Act is protected against retaliation and restrictive measures. Thus, companies are prohibited from preventing or trying to prevent a person from reporting, and retaliating against a person who reports. Furthermore, a reporting person will not be held liable for breach of confidentiality for collecting the reported information if the person had reasonable grounds to believe that it was necessary to submit the report to expose irregularities. Under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act, any person reporting irregularities in a reporting channel established under the Swedish Whistleblowing Act may also report irregularities to designated Swedish authorities.

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



## Thailand

Author: *Ratthai Kamolwarin, Norrapat Werajong*  
at Chandler MHM

It is down to the employer's discretion and subject to the whistleblowing policy (if any) to commence the investigation resulting from a complaint from a whistleblower. Whistleblowers and those who cooperate with an investigation should be protected. Normally the employer would not try to identify the whistleblowers. Also, it is best not to reveal the identity of the witness or the source of information; otherwise, they may feel uncomfortable giving information or raising their concerns next time. Any allegations of retaliation that surface during the investigation should be treated as a new report of possible misconduct that could be subject to additional investigation.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## Turkey

Author: *Elvan Aziz, Gülce Saydam Pehlivan, Emre Kotil, Osman Pepeoğlu*  
at Paksoy

Although there is no specific legislation in Turkish law on whistleblowing, necessary mechanisms need to be implemented to ensure that whistleblowers and the whistleblowing process are kept confidential. In addition, whistleblowers must be encouraged and supported to be open about raising their concerns in good faith. A whistleblowing activity, when it amounts to raising a concern in good faith, must not be mistreated by the employer. Employers should also put in place protection mechanisms against the mistreatment of whistleblowers or retaliation towards them by other employees.

Last updated on 15/09/2022



## United Kingdom

## United Kingdom

Author: *Phil Linnard, Clare Fletcher*  
at Slaughter and May

The employer should first identify which individuals may have protection as whistleblowers. This could be a current or former employee who raises the initial complaint, a co-worker who gives evidence as part of the investigation, or the accused employee.

In each case, consider whether a “protected disclosure” has been made (under Part IVA ERA 1996). This requires analysis of the subject matter of the disclosure, how it is made, and a reasonable belief that it is made in the public interest.

Employers must then ensure there is no detrimental treatment or dismissal of any worker on the grounds of their protected disclosure. Although the causation test for these purposes is not straightforward, as a general rule if the protected disclosure has a “material influence” on the decision to discipline or dismiss, there may be liability. Individual managers may be personally liable alongside the employer. Compensation for whistleblowing cases is uncapped, meaning businesses and individuals can face significant financial and reputational exposure.

What this means in practical terms is that the employer should promote a “speak-up” culture and, where protected disclosures are made, ensure they are handled by a team who are properly trained in how to do so.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## United States

Author: *Rachel G. Skaistis, Eric W. Hilfers, Jenny X. Zhang*  
at Cravath, Swaine & Moore

Several federal, state, and local employment laws prohibit retaliation against employees who come forward with complaints or participate in corporate investigations. Employees who possess information regarding corporate misconduct may also be considered whistleblowers protected from retaliation under federal and state whistleblower laws, including but not limited to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, and the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010.

An employee generally does not need to show that he or she was terminated or demoted to bring a retaliation claim; other actions on the part of the employer may qualify if they could be seen to discourage employees from raising complaints. To protect against a potential retaliation claim, employers should make clear at the outset of an investigation that retaliation will not be tolerated and require the complaining employee (and potentially his or her manager) to bring any instances of retaliation to the investigator’s attention immediately.

Last updated on 15/09/2022

## Vietnam

Author: *Stephen Le, Trang Le*  
at Le & Tran Law Corporation

It is up to the employer to determine whether or not to open an investigation after a complaint from a whistleblower. It is very important that the identity of the whistleblower is protected and that the employer also should not reveal the identity of the witness or the source of information, as the sources and witnesses may fear retaliation and feel uncomfortable or hesitant in giving information or raising concerns again.

## Contributors



### Australia

Joydeep Hor  
Kirryn West James  
Chris Oliver  
*People + Culture Strategies*



### Austria

Michaela Gerlach  
Sonia Ben Brahim  
*GERLACH*



### Belgium

Nicolas Simon  
*Van Olmen & Wynant*



### Brazil

Patricia Barboza  
Maury Lobo  
*CGM*



### China

Leo Yu  
Yvonne Gao  
Tracy Liu  
Larry Lian  
*Jingtian & Gongcheng*



### Finland

Anu Waaralinna  
Mari Mohsen  
*Roschier*



### France

Pascale Lagesse  
Valentino Armillei  
*Bredin Prat*



### Germany

Hendrik Bockenheimer

Susanne Walzer  
Musa Müjdeci  
*Hengeler Mueller*



## Greece

Angeliki Tsatsi  
Anna Pechlivanidi  
Pinelopi Anyfanti  
Katerina Basta  
*Karatzas & Partners*



## Hong Kong

Wynne Mok  
Jason Cheng  
Audrey Li  
*Slaughter and May*



## India

Atul Gupta  
Kanishka Maggon  
Kopal Kumar  
*Trilegal*



## Ireland

Bláthnaid Evans  
Mary Gavin  
*Ogier*



## Italy

Giovanni Muzina  
Arianna Colombo  
*BonelliErede*



## Japan

Chisako Takaya  
*Mori Hamada & Matsumoto*



## Netherlands

Barbara Kloppert  
Mirjam Kerkhof  
Roel de Jong  
*De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek*



## Nigeria

Adekunle Obebe  
*Bloomfield LP*



## Philippines

Rashel Ann C. Pomoy  
*Villaraza & Angangco*



## Poland

Wioleta Polak  
Aleksandra Stępniewska  
Julia Jewgraf  
*WKB Lawyers*



## Portugal

André Pestana Nascimento  
*Uría Menéndez - Proença de Carvalho*



## Singapore

Jonathan Yuen  
Doreen Chia  
Tan Ting Ting  
*Rajah & Tann Singapore*



## South Korea

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



## Spain

Sergio Ponce  
Daniel Cerrutti  
*Uría Menéndez*



## Sweden

Henric Diefke  
Tobias Normann  
Alexandra Baron  
*Mannheimer Swartling*



## Switzerland

Laura Widmer  
Sandra Schaffner  
*Bär & Karrer*



## Thailand

Ratthai Kamolwarin  
Norrapat Werajong



## Turkey

Elvan Aziz  
Gülce Saydam Pehlivan  
Emre Kotil  
Osman Pepeoğlu  
*Paksoy*



## United Kingdom

Phil Linnard  
Clare Fletcher  
*Slaughter and May*



## United States

Rachel G. Skaistis  
Eric W. Hilfers  
Jenny X. Zhang  
*Cravath, Swaine & Moore*



## Vietnam

Stephen Le  
Trang Le  
*Le & Tran Law Corporation*