

- Troll through historical social media posts to accuse workers of misconduct in their personal lives
- Repeatedly and regularly suspend workers without serving them with any allegations of misconduct, sometimes up to, or even over, a year
- Repeatedly fail to particularise allegations, using broad and vague language to justify suspending workers without sufficient cause
- Recklessly re-traumatise victims of misconduct to correct PCI investigation mistakes
- Fail to follow chain of command by inserting PCI into matters that local management have preferred to handle
- Regularly accuse workers of theft for minor errors in timesheet entries
- Regularly extend investigations for months or even years, causing massive psychological, emotional and financial suffering for workers
- Appear at demotion and termination meetings. This is a conflict of interest as PCI also advise the decision maker. PCI could be perceived to have a vested interest to demote/terminate the worker to justify its investigation costs.
- Regularly undertake “fishing” expeditions by accessing private or personal correspondence to search for misconduct. This often happens even though there has been no complaint filed by anyone.
- Regularly go beyond the scope of the investigation during in person interviews. PCI does so by asking workers about unrelated or loosely co-related matters to see if they can commence a further investigation as a “matter arising.”
- Lack of general oversight, governance or transparency as to PCI internal policy and practices. It appears they have no limits.
- Failure to apply the basic principles of natural justice
- Approach all investigations with a “guilty until proven innocent” mindset.
- Fail to supply workers subject to an investigation with the grounds for suspension or restriction in duties. Workers have to demand the basis for their suspensions through the IRC. The IRC supports providing this information and they regularly obstruct IRC directives to do so
- Regularly surprise workers with evidence in an investigation at the interview. This restricts workers’ right to seek advice from their union or lawyer about their rights. They are “put on the spot.” This is unfair and would not stand up in court