

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 ‘**Act 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-1085.3-6388/22-I) via IMI in accordance with Article 61 procedure - 449127.
2. The complaint was lodged against the controller [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (“[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:

*“On 16.07.2022, the complainant submitted a request for deletion under Article 17 of the GDPR of his hacked customer account to the German branch of the controller. On 18.07.2022, the deletion request was repeated at the email address of the controller [REDACTED] without the account being deleted.*

[...]

**Deliberation n° 49/RECL16/2024 of 26 July 2024 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file n° 9.317 lodged against the company [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 449127**

*On 09.09.2022, the complainant then submitted a new request for deletion to the controller in accordance with Article 17 of the GDPR. He then received a notification from the controller on how to delete the account. He then received a one-time password to access the blocked account. However, it was not possible to log in to the blocked account with this one-time password. Further e-mails between the complainant and the responsible person did not lead to any result.*

*[...]."*

4. In essence, the complainant asks the CNPD to request [REDACTED] to comply with his request to erasure.
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] 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 GDPR, the 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:
  - The request sent by the complainant was not processed correctly. This was a human error and not in line with [REDACTED] standard operating procedure;
  - [REDACTED] has then escalated the complainant’s account closure request and has reached out to him apologizing for this delay;
  - [REDACTED] has also informed the complainant of the consequences of an account closure and proceeded with the account closure process, unless the complainant objected to the closure within 15 days upon receipt of [REDACTED] message;
  - In addition to processing the complainant’s closure request as a priority, [REDACTED] had taken additional steps to remind its internal departments on how to recognize and handle an account closure request.

## **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 Articles 17 GDPR.



**Deliberation n° 49/RECL16/2024 of 26 July 2024 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file n° 9.317 lodged against the company [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 449127**

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 9.317 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]

**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.