

In the matter of the General Data Protection Regulation

DPC Complaint Reference: [REDACTED]

IMI Number: [REDACTED]

In the matter of a complaint, lodged by [REDACTED] with the Hellenic Data Protection Authority pursuant to Article 77 of the General Data Protection Regulation, concerning MTCH Technology Services Limited

Record of Amicable Resolution of the complaint and its consequent withdrawal pursuant to Section 109(3) of the Data Protection Act, 2018

Further to the requirements of EDPB Guidelines 06/2022 on the practical implementation of amicable settlements Version 2.0 (adopted on 12 May 2022)

**RECORD OF AMICABLE RESOLUTION FOR THE
PURPOSE OF EDPB GUIDELINES 06/2022 ON THE
PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF AMICABLE
SETTLEMENTS VERSION 2.0 (ADOPTED ON 12 MAY
2022)**

Dated the 21st day of October 2022



Data Protection Commission
21 Fitzwilliam Square South
Dublin 2, Ireland

Background

1. On 24 April 2020, ██████████ (“the **Data Subject**”) lodged a complaint pursuant to Article 77 GDPR with the Hellenic Data Protection Authority in Greece (“the **Recipient SA**”) concerning MTCH Technology Services Limited (“the **Respondent**”).
2. In circumstances where the Data Protection Commission (“the **DPC**”) was deemed to be the competent authority for the purpose of Article 56(1) GDPR, the Recipient SA transferred the complaint to the DPC on 20 October 2020.

The Complaint

3. The details of the complaint were as follows:
 - a. The Data Subject’s account was suspended by the Respondent. The Data Subject subsequently submitted an erasure request to the Respondent under Article 17 GDPR, as well as raising concerns with regards to the accessibility in finding channels of contact to the DPO.
 - b. The Data Subject was dissatisfied with the response received from the Respondent and believed that their request for erasure had not been fulfilled by the Respondent, nor had their concerns with regards to accessing the DPO channels been properly addressed.
 - c. As the Data Subject was not satisfied with the response received from the Respondent regarding the concerns raised, the Data Subject lodged a complaint with their supervisory authority.

Action taken by the DPC

4. The DPC, pursuant to Section 109(4) of the Data Protection Act, 2018 (“the **2018 Act**”), is required, as a preliminary matter, to assess the likelihood of the parties to the complaint reaching, within a reasonable time, an amicable resolution of the subject-matter of the complaint. Where the DPC considers that there is a reasonable likelihood of such an amicable resolution being concluded between the parties, it is empowered, by Section 109(2) of the 2018 Act, to take such steps as it considers appropriate to arrange or facilitate such an amicable resolution.
5. Following a preliminary examination of the material referred to it by the Recipient SA, the DPC considered that there was a reasonable likelihood of the parties concerned reaching, within a reasonable time, an amicable resolution of the subject matter of the complaint. The DPC’s experience is that complaints of this nature are particularly suitable for amicable resolution in circumstances where there is an obvious solution to the dispute, if the respondent is willing to engage in the process. In this regard, the DPC had regard to:
 - a. The relationship between the Data Subject and Respondent (being, in this case, an individual consumer and a service provider); and

- b. The nature of the complaint (in this case, an unsuccessful attempt by the Data Subject to exercise his/her data subject rights).
- 6. While not relevant to the assessment that the DPC is required to carry out pursuant to Section 109(4) of the 2018 Act, the DPC also had regard to EDPB Guidelines 06/2022 on the practical implementation of amicable settlements Version 2.0, adopted on 12 May 2022 (“**Document 06/2022**”), and considered that:
 - a. the possible conclusion of the complaint by way of amicable resolution would not hamper the ability of the supervisory authorities to maintain the high level of protection that the GDPR seeks to create; and that
 - b. such a conclusion, in this case, would likely carry advantages for the Data Subject, whose rights under the GDPR would be vindicated swiftly, as well as for the controller, who would be provided the opportunity to bring its behaviour into compliance with the GDPR.

Amicable Resolution

- 7. The DPC engaged with both the Data Subject (via the Recipient SA) and Respondent in relation to the subject matter of the complaint. Further to that engagement, it was established that the Respondent had suspended the Data Subject’s account and following this suspension, it had retained the Data Subject’s personal data. According to the Respondent, the retention of this data was in line with the Respondent’s data retention policy. Following our engagement, the Respondent agreed to take the following action:
 - a. The Respondent agreed to conduct a fresh review of the Data Subject’s ban. Following this review, the Respondent made a decision to lift the ban. By lifting the ban, this action provided the Data Subject with access to their account and the ability to self-delete the account, should they still wish to do so.
 - b. The Respondent communicated the outcome of their review to the Data Subject.
- 8. Upon receipt of this information from the Respondent, the DPC wrote to the Data Subject via the Recipient SA to inform them that the account ban had been lifted, and the Data Subject could therefore proceed with the erasure of their account. In response to this letter, in correspondence received by the DPC on 5 January 2022, the Data Subject indicated to the DPC that his concerns remained with regards to the retention policies in place, and the accessibility to the channels of contact to the DPO.
- 9. The DPC contacted the Respondent on 28 January 2022 in relation to the above concerns. In response to this contact, in correspondence received by the DPC on 11 February 2022, the Respondent provided information on its retention policies and information on the DPO contact details as per its privacy policy.

10. On 13 April 2022, the DPC issued correspondence to the Recipient SA for onward transmission to the Data Subject. This correspondence provided information to the Data Subject in respect of the final element of their complaint, and addressed the concerns raised about the channels of contact to the Respondent's DPO, and its retention policies. This correspondence sought the views of the Data Subject, as to whether their concerns were adequately addressed.
11. On 8 June 2022, the Recipient SA advised the DPC that a response had been received from the Data Subject confirming that the issue had been resolved. A translated copy of the email from the Data Subject, confirming their satisfaction was forwarded to the DPC on 15 June 2022. Accordingly, the complaint has been deemed to have been amicably resolved.
12. On 25 July 2022 and in light of the foregoing, the DPC wrote to the Recipient SA noting that the DPC considered the complaint to have been amicably resolved and withdrawn in accordance with section 109(3) of the Act and that it would conclude the case and inform the Respondent.
13. In circumstances where the subject matter of the complaint has been amicably resolved, in full, the complaint, by virtue of Section 109(3) of the 2018 Act, is deemed to have been withdrawn by the Data Subject.

Confirmation of Outcome

14. For the purpose of Document 06/2022, the DPC confirms that:
 - a. The complaint, in its entirety, has been amicably resolved between the parties concerned;
 - b. The agreed resolution is such that the object of the complaint no longer exists; and
 - c. Having consulted with the supervisory authorities concerned on the information set out above, as required by Document 06/2022 the DPC has now closed off its file in this matter.
15. If dissatisfied with the outcome recorded herein, the parties have the right to an effective remedy by way of an application for judicial review, by the Irish High Court, of the process applied by the DPC in the context of the within complaint.

Signed for and on behalf of the DPC:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tony Delaney". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent 'T' and 'D'.

Deputy Commissioner
Data Protection Commission