

Having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (the ‘**GDPR**’);

Having regard to the Act of¹ August 2018 on the organisation of the National Commission for Data Protection and the General Data Protection Regime (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**Law of August 2018**’);

Having regard to the Rules of Procedure of the National Commission for Data Protection adopted by Decision No 3AD/2020 of 22 January 2020 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**ROI**’);

Having regard to the complaints procedure before the National Commission for Data Protection adopted on 16 October 2020 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**Complaint Procedure before the CNPD**’);

Having regard to the following:

I. Facts and procedure

1. In the framework of European cooperation, as provided for in Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation or GDPR), the supervisory authority of Ireland submitted to the National Data Protection Commission (hereinafter: “the CNPD”) the complaint of [REDACTED] (national reference of the authority concerned: C-19-12-55) via IMI in accordance with the procedure Article 61-103737.
2. The complaint was lodged against the controller [REDACTED] which has its principal place of business in Luxembourg. Under Article 56 GDPR, the CNPD is therefore competent to act as the lead supervisory authority.
3. The initial claim in IMI stated the following:

“The Irish data subject raised their initial concern to the DPC via webform received 29th November 2019. The DS outlines in their webform their concerns regarding the DC’s non

response to their erasure request which was sent 19th November 2019. The DS stated that they can still access their account and that [REDACTED] are still processing their request.

4. In essence, the claimant asks the CNPD to ask [REDACTED] to grant it access to its data, but without using the download tools in the [REDACTED] account.
5. The complaint is therefore based on Article 17 GDPR.
6. On the basis of this complaint and pursuant to Article 57(1)(f) GDPR, the CNPD requested the controller to take a position on the facts reported by the complainant and in particular to provide a detailed description of the issue relating to the processing of the complainant's data, and in particular as regards his right to erasure.
7. The controller provided the requested information within the time limits set by the CNPD.

II. In law

1. Applicable legal provisions

8. Article 77 GDPR provides that *“without prejudice to any other administrative or judicial remedy, any data subject shall have the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority, (...) if he considers that the processing of personal data concerning him or her constitutes a breach of this Regulation.”*
9. In accordance with Article 17 GDPR *“The data subject shall have the right to obtain from the controller the erasure, as soon as possible, of personal data concerning him or her and the controller shall have the obligation to erase such personal data as soon as possible, where one of the following grounds applies (...);”*
10. Article 56(1) GDPR states that *“the supervisory authority of the main establishment or single establishment of the controller or processor shall be competent to act as the lead supervisory authority in respect of the cross-border processing carried out by that controller or processor in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article 60”;*
11. According to Article 60(1) GDPR, *“The lead supervisory authority shall cooperate with the other supervisory authorities concerned in accordance with this Article by endeavouring to reach consensus. The lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned shall exchange any relevant information;*

12. According to Article 60(3) GDPR, "The lead supervisory authority shall, without delay, communicate relevant information on the matter to the other supervisory authorities concerned. It shall without delay submit a draft decision to the other supervisory authorities concerned with a view to obtaining their opinion and shall take due account of their views";

2. In the present case

13. Following the intervention of the Luxembourg supervisory authority, the controller confirmed that:

- [REDACTED] had in fact two [REDACTED] accounts associated with the same email address. From correspondence with [REDACTED], [REDACTED] understood that the second account was created by mistake by [REDACTED] and that it was a duplicate account. The main account was always open and was also actively used by [REDACTED] but, following a request from [REDACTED], the duplicate account was effectively closed.

[REDACTED] requested that the double account be deleted on 19 November 2019. An email was sent asking [REDACTED] to reply to the e-mail to confirm that he wanted to delete his account (as shown to the CNPD). [REDACTED] had no trace of [REDACTED] having responded to this email and confirming his request to delete the account, and [REDACTED]'s additional email suggested that he did not complete this step.

- On November 26, 2019, [REDACTED] sent another email stating that he could still access his account and asked to "delete the account" (as shown to the CNPD). This was accepted as evidence that [REDACTED] wanted to delete his account and that the [REDACTED] team started the process of deleting [REDACTED]'s duplicate account and closed the account on the same day. [REDACTED]'s customer service then informed [REDACTED] on November 26, 2019 (as shown to the CNPD).

3. Outcome of the case

14. The Plenary Training therefore considers that, following the investigation of this complaint, the controller has taken the appropriate steps to grant the request for the right of erasure of the complainant, in accordance with Article 17 of the General Data Protection Regulation.

15. Therefore, in the light of the foregoing, and the residual nature of the gravity of the alleged facts and the degree of impact on fundamental rights and freedoms, it does not appear necessary to continue to deal with that complaint.
16. The CNPD then consulted Ireland’s supervisory authority under Article 60(1) if it agreed to close the case. The Irish supervisory authority replied in the affirmative, with the result that the CNPD came to the conclusion that no further action was necessary and that the cross-border complaint could be closed.

In view of the above, the CNPD, sitting in plenary and deliberating unanimously, decided:

- To close complaint file No. 4.595 upon completion of its investigation, in accordance with the complaints procedure before the CNPD and after obtaining the agreement of the authority concerned.

Thus decided in Belvaux on 10 June 2022.

The National Commission for Data Protection

[REDACTED]
Chair

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Commissioner Commissioner



Deliberation No 23/RECL13/2022 of 10 June 2022 of the National Commission for Data Protection sitting in plenary session on complaint file No 4.595 lodged against [REDACTED]

Indication of remedies

This Administrative Decision may be the subject of an appeal for amendment within three months of its notification. Such an action must be brought by the interested party before the administrative court and must be brought by a lawyer at the Court of one of the Bar Associations.