

Employment in Financial Services

Contributing Editor

Louise Skinner at Morgan Lewis & Bockius

11. Are there any particular requirements that employers should implement with respect to the prevention of wrongdoing, for example, related to whistleblowing or the prevention of harassment?



Hong Kong

Author: *Charles Mo, Joanne Mok*
at Morgan Lewis & Bockius

Anti-money laundering and counter-financing of terrorism

Financial services employees are required to receive training on anti-money laundering and counter-financing of terrorism. New staff should be required to attend initial training as soon as possible after being hired or appointed. Apart from the initial training, refresher training should be provided regularly to ensure that staff are reminded of their responsibilities and are kept informed of new developments (see question 8).

Whistleblowing

There is no single comprehensive whistleblowing legislation to protect whistleblowers in Hong Kong. However, piecemeal provisions in various ordinances may protect specific whistleblowers for the reporting of specific offences. For example, the Employment Ordinance provides that an employer shall not terminate (or threaten to terminate) the employment of, or in any way discriminate against, an employee because the employee has given evidence or information in any proceedings or inquiry in connection with the enforcement of the Employment Ordinance, work accidents or breach of work safety legislation.

While it is not legally required, as good practice, employers should consider implementing a whistleblowing policy to set out, among others, the type of incidents that should be reported and the procedures for filing the report.

Workplace harassment

Under the Sex Discrimination Ordinance, Disability Discrimination Ordinance and Race Discrimination Ordinance, any harassment in the workplace based on sex, pregnancy, disability and race (which includes colour, descent, ethnic or national origins) is unlawful.

As employers are vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of their employees (whether or not the act was done with the employer's knowledge or approval), one of the statutory defences is for employers to

establish that they took “reasonably practicable steps” to prevent the wrongful act in the workplace. Employers should therefore put in place anti-harassment policies and procedures to prevent harassment from happening in the workplace and to provide complaint or reporting procedures to handle such incidents.

Last updated on 22/01/2023

Switzerland

Author: *Simone Wetzstein, Matthias Lötscher, Sarah Vettiger*
at Walder Wyss

There are no specific whistleblowing laws in Switzerland, but employees have a right to report grievances and misconduct to their employer, provided that they do not commit a breach of a fiduciary duty or cause damage (eg, malicious false reports).

However, employees must also report material facts or incidents of misconduct and the misconduct of other employees discovered in the course of their work to their employer under the employee's duty of loyalty.

On the other hand, an employee's duty of loyalty and, in particular, an employee's statutory duty of confidentiality flowing from it may also give rise to a duty to not report.

Based on the current legal situation, there may be a conflict between an employee's need to report grievances (internally or externally) and a possible duty to not report with regard to an external report. An attempt to resolve this conflict through legislation has failed, and a new attempt to introduce whistleblowing legislation in Switzerland is not expected anytime soon.

Concerning whistleblowing by employees to a public authority or even to the public, employees are regularly prevented from doing so by confidentiality obligations under criminal law. Any justification for such a disclosure will usually only be examined in the context of a criminal investigation against the employee.

However, larger companies have taken measures and set up certain processes to uncover and prevent wrongdoing without having to do so under mandatory laws. For instance, companies have implemented internal or external reporting offices.

When it comes to harassment, an employer is explicitly required to protect employees from sexual harassment (prevention) and to protect any victims from further disadvantages (active protection). According to the Gender Equality Act, victims of sexual harassment may be awarded compensation of up to six months' wages by the courts, in addition to damages and restitution, unless the employer can prove that they have "taken all measures that are necessary and appropriate according to experience to prevent sexual harassment and that they can reasonably be expected to take". Employers are therefore advised to actively address the issue of sexual harassment (as well as general discrimination and bullying) in the workplace and include it in their regulations or directives.

Last updated on 16/04/2024

13. Are there any particular rules that apply in relation to the use of post-termination restrictive covenants for employees in the financial services sector?



Hong Kong

Author: *Charles Mo, Joanne Mok*
at Morgan Lewis & Bockius

There are no particular rules that apply concerning the use of post-termination restrictive covenants for employees in the financial services sector. The rules concerning post-termination restrictive covenants are governed by common law principles in which they will only be enforced if the restriction is necessary for the protection of the employer's legitimate business interest and is reasonable in scope and duration.

Last updated on 22/01/2023

Switzerland

Author: *Simone Wetzstein, Matthias Lötscher, Sarah Vettiger*
at Walder Wyss

There are no particular rules that apply concerning the use of post-termination restrictive covenants for employees in the financial services sector in Switzerland. Rather, general post-contractual non-compete regulations come into play: the parties of an employment contract may agree on a non-compete clause, which must be included in the employment contract in writing to be valid. For the non-compete clause to be relevant, it must be sufficiently limited in terms of time, place and subject matter. Normally, the duration of a post-termination non-compete clause is no more than one year; however, the statutorily permissible duration is three years.

As a prerequisite for a contractual non-compete clause to be binding, access to sensitive data is required. The employee must either have access to customer data or manufacturing or business secrets. However, access alone is not enough. There must also be the possibility of harming the employer using this knowledge.

If a relationship between the customer and the employee or employer is personal (which is, for example, the case for lawyers or doctors), a post-termination non-compete clause is not applicable according to the Federal Supreme Court.

If there is an excessive non-compete clause, this can be restricted by a judge. In practice, most of the time, no restriction of the post-termination non-compete clause is imposed if the employer offers consideration in return for the agreement. The prohibition of competition may become invalid for two reasons. Firstly, the clause can become irrelevant if the employer has no more interest in maintaining the non-compete clause. Secondly, the clause is not effective if the employer has terminated the employment relationship. However, this does not apply if the employee has given the employer a reason to terminate the employment relationship.

Swiss employment law does not provide for any compensation for a post-termination non-compete clause.

Last updated on 16/04/2024

Contributors



Hong Kong

Charles Mo
Joanne Mok
Morgan Lewis & Bockius



Switzerland

Simone Wetzstein

Matthias Lötscher

Sarah Vettiger

Walder Wyss

www.internationalemploymentlawyer.com