



Dear Readers,

as usual, we come to you with a selection of the most interesting HR news and topical issues of the past week.

NEW AMENDING BILL ON WORKPLACE BULLYING AND DISCRIMINATION REGULATIONS

The Ministry has presented a new proposal for changes to the workplace bullying and discrimination regulations. The key objective of this bill is to simplify and refine the legal definition of bullying, stipulating that the persistent harassment of an employee shall be classified as such, regardless of the perpetrator's intent. Furthermore, the scope of prohibited conduct is set to expand, encompassing physical, verbal, and non-verbal actions. These measures aim to foster a more supportive working environment by requiring the establishment of clear rules, procedures, and regular preventative actions. Moreover, the proposed legislation allows employers the flexibility to design and implement their own anti-violence tools and practices to suit their unique internal requirements. Given these upcoming changes, now is an ideal time for businesses to review and update their existing internal policies. Link to the bill: [here](#).

COURT RULING: UNAUTHORISED REMOTE WORK FROM ABROAD JUSTIFIES SUMMARY DISMISSAL

A recent judgment by the Wrocław labour court has confirmed that working remotely from abroad without an employer's permission constitutes grounds for summary dismissal. The case concerned an employee of an investment firm who relocated to Thailand to work remotely without informing his employer or obtaining formal consent. This action was a direct breach of internal regulations, specifically the prohibition on working outside the European Economic Area. Given that the employee had access to confidential and sensitive personal data, financial information, as well as the company's trade secrets, his use of unverified internet connections posed a significant security risk. The court found that such conduct severely compromised the employer's interests, exposing the company to potential contractual and administrative penalties, as well as the loss of client trust and business contracts. Consequently, the court ruled that the employee's actions fully justified summary dismissal. Judgment of the District Court for Wrocław-Śródmieście, 8 October 2025 (Ref. no. IV P 1415/24).

SUPREME COURT: BUSINESS CLOSURE DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY TERMINATE EMPLOYMENT

The Supreme Court has ruled that the cessation of business activity by an employer does not result in the automatic termination of employment relationships. Contracts of employment remain in force until they are formally terminated through standard procedures, such as notice of termination, mutual agreement, or termination without notice. During this interim period, the employer must continue to pay remuneration and social security contributions. The Court emphasised that neither the decision to cease operations nor unforeseen circumstances, such as the death of a Chief Executive Officer, exempt an employer from these statutory duties. Supreme Court ruling of 3 June 2025 (Ref. no. I USKP 61/24).

NEW SHORTAGE OCCUPATION LIST NOW AVAILABLE

A new draft regulation from the Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Policy identifies 329 occupations currently facing acute staff shortages in Poland. The list specifically highlights the technical and service sectors as areas where recruiting from the domestic labour market is particularly challenging. This initiative is intended to assist employers in meeting their staffing requirements more effectively in roles where domestic recruitment is proving exceptionally difficult. Link to the draft: [here](#).

COURT RULING: EMPLOYEE NOT LIABLE FOR MISSED DEADLINE DUE TO INCORRECT REPRESENTATIVE ADVICE

The District Court in Człuchów has recently ruled in a case concerning an employee who, acting on the advice of her representative, sent a written statement of her readiness to take up employment via a postal operator. The document did not reach the employer on time, and as a result, the employer refused to admit her to work. The employer argued that a declaration of intent is only considered to have been made once the addressee has had the opportunity to review it. However, the court ruled that simply exceeding a deadline does not automatically grant an employer grounds for refusing an employee's return to work. Instead, the employer must prove that the delay was due to reasons within the employee's control. In this instance, the court found that the incorrect advice provided by the representative was a justified reason beyond the employee's control. Judgment of the District Court in Człuchów, 21 November 2025 (Ref. no. IV P 87/25).

Please do not hesitate to contact us: Karolina Kanclerz, attorney-at-law, partner, **Sławomir Paruch**, attorney-at-law, partner, and **Oskar Kwiatkowski**, attorney-at-law, senior lawyer.

UPCOMING EVENTS

- **Modern employer: A step-by-step guide to employee termination — common HR mistakes and their consequences** - 10 February 2026, 11:00 – 11:45, online. Register: [here](#).
- **Webinar: Employee Benefits Fund in the new year - maximising benefits** - 11 February 2026, 11:00 – 11:45, online. Register: [here](#).
- **Workshop: Navigating trade union relations — effective crisis management** - 12 February 2026, 11:00 – 11:45, online. Register: [here](#).