

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 of 1 August 2018 on the organisation of the National Data Protection Commission and the General Data Protection Regime (hereinafter referred to as the ‘**Law of 1 August 2018**’);

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

Having regard to the complaints procedure before the National Data Protection Commission 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 the 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 Bavaria (Germany) submitted to the National Data Protection Commission (hereinafter: “the CNPD”) the complaint of [REDACTED] (national reference of the concerned authority: LDA-1085.3-1826/22-I) via IMI in accordance with Article 61 procedure - 430413.
2. The complaint was lodged against the controller [REDACTED] who has its main establishment in Luxembourg. Under Article 56 GDPR, the CNPD is therefore competent to act as the lead supervisory authority.
3. The original IMI claim stated the following:

"The complainant criticises the fact that the controller did not react to his request for deletion of 14.01.2022".

The complainant indicated that his account had been blocked a few years ago due to an outstanding payment. After unsuccessfully trying to unlock it, the complainant

Deliberation n° 48/RECL15/2024 of 26 July 2024 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file n° 9.008 lodged against the company [REDACTED] [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 430413

states that he requested several times the closure of his account and the deletion of his personal data since he noticed that several hack attempts had been made. According to the complainant, [REDACTED] did not act upon his erasure request.

4. In essence, the complainant asks the CNPD to request the data controller to grant his right to erasure, in particular the deletion of his [REDACTED] account.
5. The complaint is therefore based on Article 17 GDPR.
6. On the basis of this complaint and in accordance with Article 57(1)(f) GDPR, the CNPD requested [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 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 with regard to his right to erasure.
7. The CNPD received the requested information within the deadlines set.

II. In law

1. Applicable legal provisions

8. Article 77 GDPR provides that *“without prejudice to any other administrative or judicial remedy, every data subject shall have the right to lodge a complaint with a supervisory authority, (...) if the data subject considers that the processing of personal data relating to him or her infringes this Regulation”*;
9. In accordance with Article 17 (1) GDPR, a data subject may request the erasure of his or her personal data and the controller must erase the data subject's personal data without undue delay if one of the grounds provided for in Article 17 (1) GDPR applies, unless the controller can demonstrate that the processing falls within the scope of one of the exceptions set out in Article 17 (3) GDPR.
10. Article 56(1) GDPR provides that *“(…) the supervisory authority of the main establishment or of the single establishment of the controller or processor shall be competent to act as lead supervisory authority for the cross-border processing carried out by that controller or processor in accordance with the procedure provided 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 in*

an endeavour to reach consensus. The lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned shall exchange all relevant information with each other”;

12. According to Article 60(3) GDPR, *“The lead supervisory authority shall, without delay, communicate the 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 for their opinion and 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] looked into the complainant’s account closure requests, which were followed up with immediately after the complainant’s requests;
- [REDACTED] holds security measures in place to detect fraudulent behaviour and maintain physical, electronic as well as procedural safeguards;
- As the complainant account in question was connected to two further customer accounts, which were suspected of fraudulent activities, [REDACTED] fraud prevention process was triggered, which is designed to protect customers, and which flagged the complainant’s account on a preventative basis;
- [REDACTED] then asked their specialist teams to close the complainant’s account, which was initially prevented as the account was flagged in their fraud prevention process;
- [REDACTED] has thus successfully relaunched the account closure and data deletion process;
- Finally, there was no data breach on [REDACTED] side regarding the complainant’s customer data and the complainant has not sustained any financial damage through this account.

3. Outcome of the case

14. The CNPD, in a plenary session, therefore considers that, at the end of the investigation of the present complaint, the controller has taken appropriate measures to grant the complainant’s right to erasure, in accordance with Article 17 of the GDPR.



Deliberation n° 48/RECL15/2024 of 26 July 2024 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file n° 9.008 lodged against the company [REDACTED] [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 430413

15. Thus, 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.

In light of the above developments, the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, after having deliberated, decides:

- to close the complaint file 9.008 upon completion of its investigation, in accordance with the Complaints Procedure before the CNPD.

Belvaux, dated 26 July 2024

The National Data Protection Commission

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [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.