

iel

International Employment Lawyer

Guide to Workplace Investigations

Singapore



Contributor:

RAJAH & TANN ASIA

Singapore

Jonathan Yuen, Doreen Chia, Yap Pui Yee and Tan Ting Ting
Rajah & Tann

Starting an investigation

1. What legislation, guidance and/or policies govern a workplace investigation?

A workplace investigation is usually governed by the employer's internal grievance policy or contractual guidelines found in the employment contract or employee handbook. In the absence of the same, the default governing regime is as set out by the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) and the Tripartite Alliance for Fair and Progressive Employment Practices (TAFEP) in its guidelines and advisories, which include:

- the Tripartite Advisory on Managing Workplace Harassment;
- the TAFEP Grievance Handling Handbook; and
- the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices.

In addition, section 14(1) of the Employment Act 1968 provides that an employer is required to conduct "due inquiry" before dismissing an employee covered under the Employment Act 1968 without notice for misconduct. The Singapore Courts take the view that "due inquiry" suggests some sort of process in which the employee concerned is informed about the allegations and the evidence against him or her so that he or she has an opportunity to defend him or herself with or without evidence during the investigation process.

Further, there are numerous cases where the Singapore High Court has alluded to or implicitly accepted the application of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence in employment contracts that would oblige the employer to act reasonably and fairly during the investigation even though it is worth noting that the Singapore Court of Appeal has stated that the status of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence has not been settled in Singapore and that "[i]t remains an open question for the Court of Appeal to resolve in a more appropriate case, ideally with facts capable of bearing out a claim based directly on the existence of the implied term" (see [82] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd and another* [2022] SGHC(A) 8).

Hence, any references to the application of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence in Singapore in this article must be read in light of the above.

2. How is a workplace investigation usually commenced?

A workplace investigation usually commences with the receipt of feedback, a complaint or a grievance, by named or anonymous persons, in respect of a work-related matter or event, or the conduct of an employee.

3. Can an employee be suspended during a workplace investigation? Are there any conditions on suspension (eg, pay, duration)?

Yes. Section 14(1) read with 14(8) of the Employment Act 1968

provides that an employee can be suspended during a workplace investigation

However, pursuant to section 14(8) of the Employment Act 1968, the employer:

- may suspend the employee from work for:
 - a period not exceeding one week; or
 - such longer period as the Commissioner for Labour may determine on an application by the employer; but
- must pay the employee at least half the employee's salary during the period the employee is suspended from work.

Section 14(9) of the Employment Act 1968 further states that if the inquiry does not disclose any misconduct on the employee's part, the employer must immediately restore to the employee the full amount of the withheld salary.

In addition to the above legislative requirements, the company is required to also comply with its policies relating to such suspensions.

In terms of the threshold to be crossed before a suspension can take place, the Singapore Courts have highlighted that suspending an employee quickly as part of a "knee-jerk" reaction to an unclear or unspecific allegation with dubious credibility is arguably a breach of the implied term of mutual trust and confidence that exists in all employment relationships ([56] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd and another* [2021] SGHC 123). The employer would need to have proper and reasonable cause to suspend an employee for disciplinary purposes ([56(d)] of *Cheah Peng Hock v Luzhou Bio-Chem Technology Ltd* [2013] 2 SLR 577; [2013] SGHC 32), for example, where multiple credible sources claimed that they had been sexually harassed by an employee, and the employer had strong grounds to believe that if the employee was not suspended, the safety and wellbeing of the other employees in the organisation would be threatened.

In contrast, an employer is not entitled to suspend an employee during a workplace investigation where the employer has only received one complaint that has not been properly described or substantiated with sufficient details from an unverified or unreliable source against an employee who has a good track record with the organisation. This is especially so if the complaint is so unclear that further inquiries should be made before the allegation can be properly ascertained and characterised (see also [51] of *Dong Wei v Shell Eastern Trading (Pte) Ltd and another* [2021] SGHC 123).

4. Who should conduct a workplace investigation – any qualifications/criteria?

While there are no prescribed minimum qualifications or criteria that need to be met for any person conducting a workplace investigation, the person handling employee grievances should be someone who:

- has been authorised and empowered to do so by the employer;
- is not in a position of actual or potential conflict; and
- is independent and impartial.

The grievance handler should be familiar with the organisation's investigative procedure, have attended the relevant training to ensure full compliance with the same; and have a good understanding of the expectations and norms set out by the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices.

5. Can the employee under investigation bring legal action to stop the investigation?

The employee under investigation is entitled to apply to the Court to stop the investigation. However, the employee bears the legal burden of showing that the employer has, for instance:

- (i) failed to comply with the organisation's grievance policy;
- (ii) committed a serious breach of natural justice; and/or
- (iii) breached the implied term of mutual trust and confidence when investigating the matter, and that such a breach will, unless remedied, cause such prejudice to the employee that it would be more just for the investigation to be stopped than to be allowed to continue.

Evidence gathering

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

Singapore law does not impose any statutory or legal obligation on an employee to act as a witness in the investigation. Accordingly, an employer does not have the power to compel its employees to act as witnesses in an investigation.

Notwithstanding this, an employer may require an employee to assist in investigations pursuant to specific contractual obligations in the employee's terms of employment (as may be contained in the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations, etc). Further, a request for an employee to provide evidence of an event that he or she knows of may reasonably be deemed to be a lawful and reasonable directive from an employer.

Consequently, an employee's refusal to act as a witness may amount to an act of insubordination that may attract disciplinary action by the employer.

Employers requiring employees to act as witnesses in an investigation must ensure that they comply with the expectations and norms set out by the Tripartite Guidelines on Fair Employment Practices and the TAFEP Grievance Handling Handbook.

7. What data protection or other regulations apply when gathering physical evidence?

The employer may collect the personal data of an individual without the individual's consent or from a source other than the individual, where it is necessary for any investigation according to section 17(1) read with paragraph 4 of Part 3 of the Third Schedule of the Personal Data Protection Act 2012 (PDPA). Under section 2(1) of the PDPA, "investigation" means an investigation relating to:

- a breach of an agreement;
- a contravention of any written law, or any rule of professional conduct or other requirement imposed by any regulatory authority in the exercise of its powers under any written law; or
- (c) a circumstance or conduct that may result in a remedy or relief being available under any law.

Under the Banking Act 1970, a bank and its officers cannot

disclose customer information to third parties, subject to certain exceptions. An employer carrying out a workplace investigation does not fall within any of the exceptions.

8. Can the employer search employees' possessions/files as part of an investigation?

The employer is not allowed to search employees' personal possessions or files as part of an investigation without the employee's consent. However, such consent may be explicitly provided for in the terms of employment (as may be contained in the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations, etc). The employer may, however, search the employees' company email accounts and files if these are stored on the company's internal systems or devices.

9. What additional considerations apply when the investigation involves whistleblowing?

Under the Prevention of Corruption Act 1960 and the Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes (Confiscation of Benefits) Act 1992 (CDSA), 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 CDSA.

Confidentiality and privilege

10. What confidentiality obligations apply during an investigation?

Generally, the existence and scope of any confidentiality obligations would depend on the specific terms of the employment contract, employee handbook or the employer's internal policies and procedures in dealing with the investigations.

In the context of investigations into workplace harassment issues, the Tripartite Advisory on Managing Workplace Harassment issued by the MOM provides that the identities of the alleged harasser, affected persons and the informant should be protected unless the employer assesses that disclosure is necessary for safety reasons.

11. What information must the employee under investigation be given about the allegations against them?

There is no specific list of information about the allegations against the employee under investigation that must be provided to the employee under investigation. However, the

information provided to the employee must be sufficiently clear and specific so that the employee understands the case being made against him or her and can respond to it. The employee should also be made aware of the evidence against him or her and be given a reasonable opportunity to respond.

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

Such information can be kept confidential, subject to question 11. However, disclosure may nevertheless be compelled in court or arbitration proceedings as well as by disclosure requests or directions by the police or statutory authorities, including the MOM.

13. Can non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) be used to keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential?

Yes, NDAs can be used to keep the fact and substance of an investigation confidential. There are no express prohibitions against such NDAs under Singapore law. However, information or evidence covered by the NDA may still be discoverable in court or arbitration proceedings; and may also be subject to disclosure requests or directions by the police or statutory authorities, including the MOM.

14. When does privilege attach to investigation materials?

Litigation privilege may attach to investigation materials if there was a reasonable prospect of litigation at the time of the creation of the materials, and the materials were created for the dominant purpose of a pending or contemplated litigation.

Legal advice privilege may attach to investigation materials if the materials were created to seek or obtain legal advice; or if the materials contain legal advice that is so embedded or has become such an integral part of the materials that the legal advice cannot be redacted from them. If the legal advice is separable from the materials, then only the parts of the materials containing legal advice will be protected by privilege.

Rights to representation

15. Does the employee under investigation have a right to be accompanied/have legal representation during the investigation?

This is dependent on the employee's employment contract and the employer's internal grievance policies and investigative processes. There is no free-standing legal entitlement for an employee to have legal representation. Employers may, at their discretion, consider allowing an employee to bring a colleague or to have legal representation if such a request is reasonable, such as to provide emotional support to the employee who may view the disciplinary hearing as an unnerving and stressful experience or be advised and informed of his or her legal rights in respect of the investigation commenced against him or her.

16. If there is a works council or trade union, does it have any right to be informed or involved in the investigation?

An employee who is a member of a works council or trade union has the right to seek assistance from the works council or trade union representative (whichever is applicable) and

have the works council or trade union involved in resolving the grievances.

For unionised companies, the grievance procedure and the role of the union representative are usually set out in the collective agreement entered into between the company and the works council or trade union. In some organisations, the employee handbook or grievance policy will also state when the trade union representative will be involved in the investigation process.

17. What other support can employees involved in the investigation be given?

Employers may provide support, such as:

- i.offering counselling for its employees to encourage open discussions and communication on any issues that they may be facing or clarify any questions they may have in respect of the investigation process;
- ii.reminding its employees of its zero-retaliation policy; and, if need be
- iii.making the necessary work arrangement to minimise potential interaction that would further aggravate the conflict or situation between the employees involved.

Employers may also inform employees of the external resources available to them if they require any assistance in respect of the investigation provided by external parties such as TAFEP, the Singapore National Employers Federation, National Trade Union Congress, and Legal Aid Bureau.

Issues during the investigation

18. What if unrelated matters are revealed as a result of the investigation?

If unrelated matters that require further investigation are revealed as a result of the investigation, the employer should take the necessary steps to investigate these matters, where relevant, under the employer's grievance reporting, investigation and disciplinary processes. This should be done separately and independently from the existing investigation. Please note that section 424 of the Criminal Procedure Code imposes a legal duty on any person who is aware that another has committed certain specified offences to "immediately" report the matter to the police, "in the absence of reasonable excuse" not to do so. Failure to comply with this requirement is punishable with imprisonment for up to six months, and/or a fine.

19. What if the employee under investigation raises a grievance during the investigation?

The employer should require the employee to raise the grievance under the company's existing grievance reporting, disciplinary and investigation processes so that the grievance, to the extent that it is relevant to the current investigation, can be investigated together. Otherwise, the grievance can be dealt with separately and independently of the existing investigation.

20. What if the employee under investigation goes off sick during the investigation?

If the employee under investigation has already responded to the allegations made against him or her and his or her participation is no longer required at this stage in the

investigation, the employer may proceed with the investigation even while the employee is off sick.

However, if the employee under investigation has not responded to the allegations made against him or her and his or her participation is still required in the investigation, the company may exercise its discretion to pause the investigation until the employee can assist in the investigations. To prevent an employee from using a medical condition as an excuse to delay or avoid the investigation, the company may require the employee to provide specific medical documentation to address the issue of the employee's ability to participate in the investigation and to adjust the investigation process accordingly. For instance, instead of scheduling an in-person interview, the company may send a list of written questions for the employee to answer, and may also extend timelines for responding, etc.

If the employee is unable to return to work for the foreseeable future, the employer may consider reaching a provisional outcome based on the available evidence, which would be subject to change when the employee under investigation can return to work.

21. How do you handle a parallel criminal and/or regulatory investigation?

Generally, there are no issues with an internal investigation being conducted in parallel to a criminal or regulatory investigation. The employer should inform the authorities of the ongoing internal investigation and comply with directions from the authorities.

Outcome of investigation

22. What must the employee under investigation be told about the outcome of an investigation?

The employee under investigation should be told of the findings that have been made against the employee, the disciplinary action (if any) that will be taken against the employee and any avenue or timeline for the employee to appeal the outcome of the investigation.

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

It would suffice for a summary of the investigation's findings to be shared with the complainant and the respondent employees.

24. What next steps are available to the employer?

The employer should take any follow-up steps required and keep track of whether any appeal against the outcome of the investigation is lodged. If any appeal is lodged, the employer should handle this appeal following its internal procedure. To the extent necessary, any disciplinary measures against the respondent employee should be stayed pending the outcome of the appeal.

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?

A summary of the investigation's findings should be disclosed

to the employee who lodged the grievance and the employee under investigation.

If there are parallel criminal or regulatory investigations, the investigation findings should also be disclosed to the authorities.

Interview records or transcripts should be kept private unless disclosure is required by a court order or at the direction of the authorities.

26. How long should the outcome of the investigation remain on the employee's record?

This depends on the company's internal disciplinary policy and the severity of the offence. For instance, a written warning issued against an employee for minor misconduct is usually kept in the respondent employee's file for one year and if the employee does not commit any further breaches during this time, the written warning will be expunged. However, if there is a finding of serious misconduct, particularly if such a determination results in the dismissal of the employee, these records are generally kept in the employee's file for the duration of time such records are statutorily required to be maintained.

27. What legal exposure could the employer face for errors during the investigation?

The employer may be exposed to legal action for a failure to properly conduct the investigation, including having such portions of the investigation set aside or held to be void by the courts, and be made to pay damages to the affected employee; or face investigation and administrative penalties by regulatory authorities such as the MOM.

Visit **International Employment Lawyer** to explore the Guide to Workplace Investigations comparative reference tool. Research country-specific regulations or build your own report comparing jurisdictions.

[Click here to build your own report now](#)

Authors:



Jonathan Yuen, Rajah & Tann

Jonathan Yuen is Head of Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP's highly regarded and top-ranked Commercial Litigation; Employment & Benefits (Disputes) practice group. He is ranked as one of the Top 10 Listed individuals for employment in Singapore and recognised as a Litigation Star for Labour and Employment.

Jonathan represents C-suite executives and corporations in disputes arising from investigations, disciplinary proceedings and matters involving harassment, bullying, discrimination, wrongful dismissal, breach of fiduciary duties and confidential obligations; to prosecutions by statutory bodies, claims by unions and competitors and claw-back of bonuses and benefits.

He enforces and litigates breaches of non-solicitation, non-competition clauses and confidentiality agreements, and disputes relating to breach of employment terms, constructive dismissal, breach of employee obligations of loyalty and fidelity, diversion of corporate opportunities, claw-back of salary, bonus, commissions and stock options; and has successfully led and conducted trials as Lead Counsel in the State Courts and High Court, as well as succeeding before the Court of Appeal and has also successfully negotiated numerous private settlements that have saved his clients from going to trial.

[Learn more](#)



Doreen Chia, Rajah & Tann

Doreen Chia is a partner at Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP in the highly regarded and top-ranked Employment & Benefits (Disputes) practice group.

She advises and acts for clients ranging from local to foreign companies and multi-national corporations in an extensive range of contentious employment matters including the conduct of disciplinary investigations, defending and prosecuting wrongful dismissal, salary and payment claims, enforcement of non-competition and non-solicitation clauses and confidentiality agreements and employment-related litigation.

She also advises and acts for clients in engaging with regulatory authorities such as Ministry of Manpower (MOM), Tripartite Alliance for Fair & Progressive Employment Practices (TAFEP), Central Provident Fund Board (CPF) and Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore (IRAS) on employment-related issues.

[Learn more](#)

Authors:



Yap Pui Yee, Rajah & Tann

Yap Pui Yee is an associate at Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP in the highly regarded and top-ranked Employment & Benefits (Disputes) practice group.

She acts for and advises multinational corporations and small and medium-sized enterprises on a wide spectrum of employment law matters such as wrongful dismissal, unfair employment practices, restraint of trade and confidentiality obligations, disciplinary investigations, salary-related disputes, industrial relations, retrenchment, fiduciary duties and exit of senior executives. She supports clients by helping them understand their rights and obligations and providing them with strategic options and practice solutions to avoid or minimise regulatory, litigation and/or reputational risks.

Pui Yee also represents and advises clients in employment-related inquiry or investigations by the Ministry of Manpower (MOM), Tripartite Alliance for Fair & Progressive Employment Practices (TAFEP), Central Provident Fund Board (CPF) and Inland Revenue Authority of Singapore (IRAS).



Tan Ting Ting, Rajah & Tann

Tan Ting Ting is an associate at Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP in the highly regarded and top-ranked Employment & Benefits (Disputes) practice group.

Ting Ting acts for and advises clients on a wide range of employment matters, such as wrongful dismissal matters, enforcement of confidentiality obligations, termination of employment, restrictive covenants, retrenchment, disciplinary investigations and inquiries, as well as claims brought in the Employment Claims Tribunal.

Ting Ting also advises clients in respect of audits and inquiries conducted by regulatory authorities such as the Ministry of Manpower (MOM) and the Tripartite Alliance for Fair & Progressive Employment Practices (TAFEP) on employment matters such as wrongful dismissal, workplace bullying and harassment, and work injury compensation claims.