

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 (hereinafter: 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 framework (hereinafter: the '**Law of 1 August 2018**');

Having regard to the Rules of Procedure of the National Data Protection Commission adopted by Decision No 07AD/2024 of 23 February 2024 (hereinafter: the '**ROP**');

Having regard to the Procedure for complaints 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 Berlin (Germany) submitted to the National Data Protection Commission (hereinafter: "the **CNPD**") a complaint (national reference of the concerned authority: 521.12755 / 631.211) via IMI in accordance with Article 56 procedure - 123967.
2. The complaint was lodged against the controller [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (former "[REDACTED]" - hereafter "the controller"), 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 alleges that after complaining about unsolicited advertising by another controller, that controller informed him that the data were provided by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] The complainant contacted the controller [REDACTED] on 10.02.2020 to request information on the processing of his data and the erasure of his data. The complainant also exercised his right to object to the processing of his data but received no reply."*

4. In essence, the complainant asks the CNPD to request the controller to grant the complainant's right of access as well as his or her right to erasure.
5. The complaint is therefore based on Article 15 and 17 of the GDPR.
6. On the basis of this complaint and in accordance with Article 57(1)(f) GDPR, the CNPD requested the controller to take a position on the facts reported by the complainant and to provide a detailed description of the issue relating to the processing of the complainant's personal data, in particular with regard to the right of access and the 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 15 of the GDPR "*The data subject shall have the right to obtain from the controller confirmation as to whether or not personal data concerning him or her are being processed, and, where that is the case, access to the personal data and the following information (...)*";
10. Pursuant to Article 15(4) GDPR, "*The right to obtain a copy referred to in paragraph 3 shall not adversely affect the rights and freedoms of others.*"
11. Pursuant to Article 17 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.
12. Furthermore, in application of Article 12(2) of the GDPR "*the controller shall facilitate the exercise of data subject rights under Articles 15 to 22*". Recital 59 of the GDPR emphasises that "*Modalities should be provided for facilitating the exercise of the data subject's rights under this Regulation, including mechanisms*

*to request and, if applicable, obtain, free of charge, in particular, access to and rectification or erasure of personal data and the exercise of the right to object. The controller should also provide means for requests to be made electronically, especially where personal data are processed by electronic means."*

13. 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*";
14. 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*";
15. 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**

16. Following the intervention of the Luxembourg supervisory authority, the controller confirmed that:
  - It gave access to the complainant's personal data via a letter from the controller's lawyer.
  - The complainant did indeed receive an advertising mail.
  - The complainant's personal data was blacklisted to avoid that any further advertising mail would be send to him.
17. After a second intervention by the CNPD and as requested by the supervisory authority of Berlin, the controller further informed the CNPD that:
  - The complainant's personal data was completely erased, also from any blacklisting.

### **3. Outcome of the case**

18. 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 of access and right of erasure, in accordance with Articles 15 and 17 GDPR.
19. 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. Moreover, the CNPD is of the view that the issue has been resolved in a satisfactory manner.
20. The CNPD then consulted the supervisory authority of Berlin (Germany), pursuant to Article 60(1), whether it agreed to close the case. The Supervisory Authority of Berlin (Germany) has responded that the complainant has indicated that the case is now closed for him. The CNPD has therefore concluded that no further action was necessary and that the cross-border complaint could be closed.

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

- To close the complaint file 5.268 upon completion of its investigation, in accordance with the Complaints Procedure before the CNPD. As per Article 60(7) GDPR, the lead supervisory authority shall adopt and notify the decision to the main establishment or single establishment of the controller.

Belvaux, dated 23 April 2025

The National Data Protection Commission

[REDACTED]  
Chair

Commissioner

Commissioner



**Deliberation No 46\_RECL37\_2025 of 23 April 2025 of the  
National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on  
complaint file No 5.268 lodged against the company [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] via IMI Article 56 procedure**

**123967**

### **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.