

Labour & Employment 2020

Contributing editors

Matthew Howse, Sabine Smith-Vidal, Walter Ahrens, K Lesli Ligorner and Mark Zelek



Publisher

Tom Barnes

tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions

Claire Bagnall

claire.bagnall@lbresearch.com

Senior business development manager

Adam Sargent

adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Published by

Law Business Research Ltd

Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street

London, EC4A 4HL, UK

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. The information provided was verified between March and May 2020. Be advised that this is a developing area.

© Law Business Research Ltd 2020

No photocopying without a CLA licence.

First published 2006

Fifteenth edition

ISBN 978-1-83862-357-9

Printed and distributed by

Encompass Print Solutions

Tel: 0844 2480 112



Labour & Employment 2020

Contributing editors**Matthew Howse, Sabine Smith-Vidal, Walter Ahrens,
K Lesli Ligorner and Mark Zelek****Morgan Lewis**

Lexology Getting The Deal Through is delighted to publish the fifteenth edition of *Labour & Employment*, which is available in print and online at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through provides international expert analysis in key areas of law, practice and regulation for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners, and company directors and officers.

Throughout this edition, and following the unique Lexology Getting The Deal Through format, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the jurisdictions featured. Our coverage this year includes new chapters on Angola, Belgium, Ghana, Israel, Kenya, Myanmar, Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Turkey and Zambia.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through titles are published annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest edition or to the online version at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Every effort has been made to cover all matters of concern to readers. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We also extend special thanks to the contributing editors, Matthew Howse, Sabine Smith-Vidal, Walter Ahrens, K Lesli Ligorner and Mark Zelek of Morgan Lewis, for their continued assistance with this volume.



London

May 2020

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in June 2020

For further information please contact editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com

Contents

Global overview	5	Denmark	92
Mark E Zelek Morgan Lewis		Yvonne Frederiksen Norrbom Vinding	
Conducting global investigations amid uncertainty: a practical guide	7	Egypt	101
Louise Skinner, Keir Baker, Rebecca Kelly and K Lesli Ligorner Morgan Lewis		Mahmoud Ahmed Belal and Richard G Tibichrani Eldib Advocates	
Angola	11	Finland	106
Nuno Gouveia, Joana D'Azevedo Cunha, Carolina Bonina Cariano and Elieser Corte Real Miranda Alliance		Pekka Kiviniemi and Tuuli Willgren Kalliolaw Asianajotoimisto Oy	
Argentina	20	France	114
Mercedes Balado Bevilacqua and Analía Durán MBB Balado Bevilacqua Abogados		Sabine Smith-Vidal and Charles Dauthier Morgan Lewis	
Australia	30	Germany	125
Joydeep Hor People + Culture Strategies		Walter Ahrens Morgan Lewis	
Bangladesh	38	Ghana	137
Tanvir Quader and Maliha Ahmed Vertex Chambers		Paa Kwesi Hagan and Joshua Hormenoo Globetrotters Legal Africa	
Belgium	44	Greece	145
Chris Van Olmen Van Olmen & Wynant		Christos Theodorou, Maria Kloni and Viktoria Chatzara Rokas Law Firm	
Brazil	53	Hong Kong	154
Ana Lúcia Pinke Ribeiro de Paiva, Flavia Sulzer Augusto Dainese and Marília Chrysostomo Chessa Araújo e Policastro Advogados		Vivien Chan and Patty Chan Vivien Chan & Co	
China	66	India	162
K Lesli Ligorner Morgan Lewis		Rohit Kochhar Kochhar & Co	
Colombia	77	Indonesia	171
Vicente Umaña Carrizosa and Isabella Gandini Holland & Knight LLP		Fahrul S Yusuf SSEK Indonesian Legal Consultants	
Costa Rica	84	Ireland	179
Alexander Godínez Vargas Bufete Godinez & Asociados		Louise O'Byrne and Sarah Faulkner Arthur Cox	
		Israel	187
		Netta Bromberg Barnea Jaffa Lande	

Italy	193	Philippines	299
Angelo Zambelli Grimaldi Studio Legale		Ronald Mark C Llano, Emmar Benjoe B Panahon, Mark Kevin U Dellosa and Hans Cedric I Santos SyCip Salazar Hernandez & Gatmaitan	
Japan	205	Poland	308
Motoi Fujii and Tomoko Narita TMI Associates		Daniel Książek, Wojciech Bigaj and Paweł Krzykowski Baran, Książek, Bigaj	
Kazakhstan	218	Portugal	317
Klara A Nurgaziyeva, Marat Mukhamediyev and Zhamilya Bilisbekova Morgan Lewis		Joana Almeida Morais Leitão, Galvão Teles, Soares da Silva & Associados	
Kenya	227	Puerto Rico	325
Desmond Odhiambo and Peter Mutema Kieti Advocates LLP		Melissa C Rodriguez Morgan Lewis	
Luxembourg	234	Russia	337
Guy Castegnaro, Ariane Claverie and Christophe Domingos Castegnaro		Bela Pelman and Dmitry Dmitriev Morgan Lewis	
Malaysia	248	Singapore	347
Selvamalar Alagaratnam, Siva Kumar Kanagasabai and Foo Siew Li SKRINE		Ian Lim, Nicholas Ngo and Elizabeth Tan TSMP Law Corporation	
Mexico	256	Slovenia	364
Humberto Padilla Gonzalez Morgan Lewis		Martin Šafar and Polona Boršnak Law firm Šafar & Partners	
Monaco	263	South Korea	371
Sophie Marquet and Florence de Guzman de Saint Nicolas CMS		Ja-Hyeong Ku, Jane Young Sohn, Kwang-Sun Lee and Young-Hwan Kwon Jipyong	
Myanmar	271	Sweden	379
Lester Chua and Min Thein Rajah & Tann Asia		Robert Stromberg and Maja Kjellander Advokatfirman Cederquist KB	
Netherlands	278	Switzerland	388
Eric van Dam, Wouter Engelsman and Dennis Veldhuizen CLINT Littler		Roland Bachmann, Cristina Solo de Zaldivar, Milena Müntz Burger, Sébastien Gobat, Yannick Hostettler and Fatma Zencirkiran Wenger Plattner	
Nigeria	285	Thailand	396
Kunle Obebe Bloomfield Law		Pisut Rakwong and Wayu Suthisarnsunton Pisut & Partners	
Norway	291	Turkey	404
Tore Lerheim and Ole Kristian Olsby Hombler Olsby Littler		Sinem Birsin and Beril Çelebi Cem Inanici Tekcan Law Office	

United Arab Emirates 412

Charles S Laubach and Zahra Zaidi
Afridi & Angell

United Kingdom 422

Lee Harding and Matthew Howse
Morgan Lewis

United States 432

Thomas F Hurka, David A McManus and Michelle Seldin Silverman
Morgan Lewis

Zambia 443

Misozi Hope Masengu and Nchimunya Mwale
Novus HM Legal Practitioners

Global overview

Mark E Zelek

Morgan Lewis

US companies have gone increasingly global in recent years. Many US firms now have far-flung operations (as well as customers) spread around the world. US-based multinationals often learn the hard way that they cannot deal with overseas employees in the same manner they do with their US counterparts because of the dramatic differences between the United States and the rest of the world's labour and employment laws. This overview highlights and summarises the principal distinctions and discusses recent reforms and proposed legislation in some countries to narrow that gap.

Employment-at-will versus job stability

The United States regulates its labour market significantly less than other countries do. Unlike much of the rest of the world, there is no comprehensive statutory labour law governing individual employment relationships or constitutional recognition of labour rights in the United States. The terms of employment relationships are determined largely by employers and accepted or rejected by workers rather than imposed by the government. This is generally designed to encourage business development, job creation and the movement of workers from declining sectors of the economy to expanding sectors. The result is that the United States has a historically lower unemployment rate than that of most other nations.

The basic principle of individual labour law in the United States is the employment-at-will doctrine. Under employment-at-will, US private-sector employers can dismiss their non-unionised employees at any time for any reason or even no reason at all. Therefore, non-union US private employers do not have to demonstrate 'just cause' to terminate an employee's contract without paying severance or providing notice. They just have to make sure that the termination is not for discriminatory (eg, based on sex, age, race, national origin, religion or disability) or retaliatory reasons, which are outlawed by federal, state and, sometimes, local statutes.

On the other hand, in most other countries, both developed and developing, employees are presumed to have a basic right to keep their jobs indefinitely. Put simply, unlike in the United States, it is generally difficult to discharge employees without incurring substantial liability. Their employment can only be terminated without consequence if the employer has 'just cause'. What constitutes 'just cause' is often specifically defined in the law, and nothing less than serious misconduct qualifies. Establishing 'just cause' is typically analogous to meeting the very high burden of demonstrating wilful misconduct by an employee in an unemployment compensation hearing in the United States. If the employer cannot prove 'just cause', it must either provide a lengthy pre-termination notice period or pay a very generous severance based on seniority. For high-level, long-term employees, these severance payments can run into six or even seven figures. In addition, back wages often accrue until a ruling is made.

Importance of discrimination laws

One consequence of the fact that all employees in most countries outside the United States have 'just cause' protection is that, although there are often anti-discrimination provisions on the books as in the United

States, they are invoked far less frequently. There is no need for foreign employees who believe that they were unfairly treated to attempt to 'shoehorn' their claims to fit within anti-discrimination protections to obtain relief. Aggrieved employees simply file claims that their terminations were without 'cause'.

Employment contracts

In the United States, employees rarely have written employment contracts. Employment contracts are generally reserved only for high-level executives, and, in the absence of a written employment contract for a fixed term, US workers' employment is at-will.

By contrast, in most of the rest of the world, employment contracts are either statutorily required for all employees or highly recommended as best practice. Moreover, the minimum terms that employment contracts must contain are often outlined in statutes. In the absence of a written employment contract, it is very difficult for employers to win if disputes with foreign employees arise.

Managing termination exposure risk

Although discharged employees in most parts of the world are entitled by law to generous severance payments, the potential exposure can be quantified and can be budgeted and saved. Typically, the severance formula is set out in a statute and includes a base payment plus a multiple based on seniority of final pay for a specified period. Unlike in the United States, compensatory and punitive damages, jury trials and class and collective actions are also generally unavailable for employment claims. This greatly reduces the risk of an unexpected or runaway result.

Unionisation

Only 6.2 per cent of the US private-sector workforce is unionised, and it is doubtful that number will increase any time soon. There are currently 27 'right-to-work' states in which employees do not have to pay dues to unions to contribute to the cost of negotiating and administering union contracts. US unions claim that this weakens unions. It is notable that, in 2012, Michigan adopted a 'right-to-work' law, as it was the second manufacturing state (after Indiana) with a powerful union presence in the United States to do so.

In the rest of the world, union and other employee representation penetration is much higher. Depending on the jurisdiction, employee representation outside the United States can take a variety of forms, including trade, industry, national, regional or local unions, works councils, and health and safety and other committees with employee members.

Employee benefits

Another fundamental difference between the United States' and other countries' employment laws is in the area of employee benefits. In the United States, whether to provide fringe benefits and the scope of those benefits is at the discretion of the employer. For example, there are no

statutory requirements for paid or unpaid vacations or holidays, paid leaves of absence, medical insurance or pension plans. A US employer can even require employees to work over Christmas with no extra pay, something that would be unheard of in many parts of the world. Of course, most US employers do provide generous fringe benefits of their own volition, to attract and retain qualified workers and remain competitive, but they are not obliged to do so by law.

In most other countries, however, the labour laws require that employers provide a whole host of benefits to their employees. These benefits include mandatory vacations and holidays, and premium pay for those vacations and holidays, sick and maternity leave and leave pay, health insurance, caps on hours worked, year-end bonuses and even profit-sharing.

The gap begins to narrow

There is growing recognition worldwide that overly employee-protective labour and employment laws discourage employers from hiring new staff and have, therefore, contributed to high unemployment, particularly among young people. To address this issue, a number of countries have, in recent years, adopted changes or introduced legislation that will bring their laws more in line with the more flexible US model. These efforts are beginning to produce positive results.

For example, effective from 1 January 2020, Dutch employment law was amended to make it easier to dismiss employees by adding additional termination grounds. This change was designed to encourage employers to hire more permanent workers.

In addition, in May 2019, Mexico changed its Federal Labour Law to require unions to show majority support to demand the execution of a collective bargaining agreement. This will limit the ability of aggressive unions without majority support to shut down non-unionised businesses to force them to enter into collective bargaining agreements.

Brazil's November 2017 labour law reform allowed flexible working hours and intermittent work, and it allowed for workers to directly negotiate their terminations with management. This employer-friendly reform has worked to reduce unemployment and fight the Brazilian economic crisis. Moreover, there has been over a 30 per cent reduction in filed labour claims.

In India, the Modi government has introduced labour law reform legislation to generate employment and facilitate the ease of doing business. It considers outdated and complex labour laws to have stifled economic development.

In Puerto Rico, legislative efforts continue to repeal Law No. 80 and make Puerto Rico an 'at-will' jurisdiction. These efforts are designed to stimulate Puerto Rico's economy by attracting new businesses and making it easier for existing businesses to operate.

Even in France, with its iconic 35-hour maximum working week, the government signed labour market law reform in September 2017. This was designed to curb unemployment by eliminating obstacles to companies adding staff. Unemployment is dropping in France, although not as much as the government had hoped.

On the other hand, the US labour market is becoming slightly less flexible. For example, social media and information technology make it easier for US employers to 'weed out' potential employees, and increasingly protective anti-discrimination and retaliation laws make it more difficult to dismiss workers and therefore hire new ones. In addition, the proliferation of licensing requirements for many jobs in the United States has added barriers to entry where none previously existed.

Conclusion

Outside the United States, there is a strikingly different, more rigid and employee-protective approach to employment relationships that labour and employment practitioners need to recognise in our increasingly global economy. Nevertheless, we anticipate continued loosening

Morgan Lewis

Mark E Zelek

mark.zelek@morganlewis.com

200 South Biscayne Boulevard
Suite 5300
Miami, FL 33131-2339
United States
Tel: +1 305 415 3000
Fax: +1 305 415 3001
www.morganlewis.com

of other countries' labour and employment laws to make them more business-friendly and incentivise job creation as economic conditions improve.

Other titles available in this series

Acquisition Finance	Distribution & Agency	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Public M&A
Advertising & Marketing	Domains & Domain Names	Islamic Finance & Markets	Public Procurement
Agribusiness	Dominance	Joint Ventures	Public-Private Partnerships
Air Transport	Drone Regulation	Labour & Employment	Rail Transport
Anti-Corruption Regulation	e-Commerce	Legal Privilege & Professional Secrecy	Real Estate
Anti-Money Laundering	Electricity Regulation	Licensing	Real Estate M&A
Appeals	Energy Disputes	Life Sciences	Renewable Energy
Arbitration	Enforcement of Foreign Judgments	Litigation Funding	Restructuring & Insolvency
Art Law	Environment & Climate Regulation	Loans & Secured Financing	Right of Publicity
Asset Recovery	Equity Derivatives	Luxury & Fashion	Risk & Compliance Management
Automotive	Executive Compensation & Employee Benefits	M&A Litigation	Securities Finance
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Financial Services Compliance	Mediation	Securities Litigation
Aviation Liability	Financial Services Litigation	Merger Control	Shareholder Activism & Engagement
Banking Regulation	Fintech	Mining	Ship Finance
Business & Human Rights	Foreign Investment Review	Oil Regulation	Shipbuilding
Cartel Regulation	Franchise	Partnerships	Shipping
Class Actions	Fund Management	Patents	Sovereign Immunity
Cloud Computing	Gaming	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Sports Law
Commercial Contracts	Gas Regulation	Pharma & Medical Device Regulation	State Aid
Competition Compliance	Government Investigations	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Structured Finance & Securitisation
Complex Commercial Litigation	Government Relations	Ports & Terminals	Tax Controversy
Construction	Healthcare Enforcement & Litigation	Private Antitrust Litigation	Tax on Inbound Investment
Copyright	Healthcare M&A	Private Banking & Wealth Management	Technology M&A
Corporate Governance	High-Yield Debt	Private Client	Telecoms & Media
Corporate Immigration	Initial Public Offerings	Private Equity	Trade & Customs
Corporate Reorganisations	Insurance & Reinsurance	Private M&A	Trademarks
Cybersecurity	Insurance Litigation	Product Liability	Transfer Pricing
Data Protection & Privacy	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Product Recall	Vertical Agreements
Debt Capital Markets		Project Finance	
Defence & Security Procurement			
Dispute Resolution			

Also available digitally

[lexology.com/gtdt](https://www.lexology.com/gtdt)