EMPLOYEES BEHAVING BADLY: A 5-POINT PLAN FOR CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS AND IMPROVING WORKPLACE RELATIONS

Richard Yeomans and Michelle de Kluyver



MORE IMAGINATION MORE IMPACT





SPEAKERS



MICHELLE DE KLUYVER Partner, Global Investigations



RICHARD YEOMANS Partner, Employment

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO COVER?

Why conduct an internal investigation?

- Planning the investigation: scoping and the first 24 hours
- Legal Privilege
- Project delivery: data mining, interviews and expert evidence
- Reporting the outcome of the investigation
- Post investigation actions (e.g. disciplinary, standard of fairness, regulatory referral, criminal proceedings ...)



INVESTIGATIONS: INCREASED VOLUME, PROFILE AND COMPLEXITY

More whistleblowing and cultural shift (e.g., #metoo) – greater awareness / publicity

More complex – e.g. increased regulatory overlay / reporting

More use of independent / external investigators

PLANNING AND SCOPING

SCOPING: TERMS OF REFERENCE



SCOPING

Objective setting	What are the immediate lines of enquiry?What is the overall objective?
Probability / impact	 How serious are the alleged issues? What evidence is available?
assessment	
Resource requirements	How many people will be needed?What skill sets or subject matters experts?



THE FIRST 24 HOURS: TEAM SELECTION



THE FIRST 24 HOURS: DATA RETENTION AND RECOVERY





THE FIRST 24 HOURS: NOTIFICATIONS

- Consider whether any internal communications are necessary
- Is any form of notification or report required?
 - FCA / NCA / Police / Insurers / Lenders / Market Announcements
- PR consultants may be required in cases where likelihood of publicity

LEGAL PRIVILEGE



LEGAL PRIVILEGE

- Why conduct an internal investigation?
- Legal Advice Privilege: communications between lawyers and clients for the dominant purpose of legal advice
- Litigation Privilege (wider): dominant purpose is litigation whether existing or contemplated
- Reasons for wanting privilege:
 - To ascertain legal / regulatory liability
 - To keep control and maximize options
- Reasons for not wanting privilege?



LEGAL PRIVILEGE

- SFO v ENRC (2018) CA
 - Overturned narrow approach to Litigation Privilege in internal investigations
 - Narrow definition of "client" from Three Rivers remains
- Identifying "client" group: control distribution
- Labelling emails / documents "confidential & legally privileged"
- Witness statements legally privileged?
- Secure email address + passwords

PROJECT DELIVERY



ORGANISING INTERVIEWS

Identify potential witnesses / suspects

Establish the order of interviews

Agree the format of interviews:

- Fact finding / inquisitorial?
- Method of recording?
- Provision of legal assistance?

Prepare interview bundles

CONDUCTING INTERVIEWS

Be prepared!	Use appropriately trained interviewers	 Tailor approach according to the nature of the interview e.g. avoid leading questions on fact-finding interviews
Never give unnecessary or inappropriate assurances	Keep it formal but neutral – even with 'friendly' witnesses	Give witnesses time to consider and answer questions – do not harass / bully
Do not feel compelled to stick rigidly to pre-planned questions	Do not express a view or opinion on the witness' evidence	Recording the interview – form, approval and retention, privilege



OUTCOMES



REPORTING

- Disciplined reporting
- Be clear about the findings and recommendations
- Produce provisional report
- Care with language / phraseology Who will see the report?
- Consider who needs to see the drafts Do not risk losing privilege
- Consider the format of the report Executive Summary / Principal Conclusions?
- May be appropriate to share extracts with interviewees for comment ("Maxwellisation")
- Sharing the report limited waiver

EMPLOYMENT AND REGULATORY TENSIONS

- "Fitness / propriety" regulatory creep?
- Compliance will be involved and may have their own view of severity of conduct
- Decision-maker may have the benefit of advice, but it should not be a joint or collaborative decision
- Decision should not be pre-judged
- Attempts to avoid disciplinary findings
- Obligations to supply information to regulators



POST INVESTIGATION ACTIONS

DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

- Standard of fairness
 - Disciplinary = impact on long term career prospects
 - Dismissal = loss of approved status (regulated profession)
 - Implications for standard disciplinary process:
 - Right to legal representation? (R (on the application of G) v Governors of X School [2011])
 - Investigator must be even-handed (Salford Royal NHS Trust v. Roldan [2010])
- Parallel criminal proceedings

OTHER POST INVESTIGATION ACTIONS

100

Workplace relationships



Mediation

Implementing recommendations

•••

Media / Comms strategy NDAs

Law Society
 Practice Note

QUESTIONS AND FOLLOW UP

MORE IMAGINATION MORE IMPACT

addleshawgoddard.com

© Addleshaw Goddard LLP. This document is for general information only and is correct as at the publication date. It is not legal advice, and Addleshaw Goddard assumes no duty of care or liability to any party in respect of its content. Addleshaw Goddard is an international legal practice carried on by Addleshaw Goddard LLP and its affiliated undertakings – please refer to the Legal Notices section of our website for country-specific regulatory information.

For further information, including about how we process your personal data, please consult our website www.addleshawgoddard.com or www.aglaw.com. ADD.DOC.228.21