

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 France submitted to the National Data Protection Commission (hereinafter: "the CNPD") a complaint (national reference of the concerned authority: 19002354) via IMI in accordance with Article 61 procedure - 62996.
2. The complaint was lodged against the controller [REDACTED] (hereafter "[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 French complainant is an author of a book. This book has been published on the [REDACTED] platform by his publisher "[REDACTED]". Nonetheless, the contract between the complainant and his publisher is now terminated and the book is no longer for sale. The complainant asked [REDACTED] to withdraw the pages dedicated to his book and to his biography (written for his publisher [REDACTED] and reused on [REDACTED] allegedly against his will). [REDACTED] did not fulfill that request. It considers that the author cannot ask for the withdrawal of information*

**Deliberation No 51\_RECL42\_2025 of 23 April 2025 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file No 4.187 lodged against the company [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 62996**

*as he is not the direct seller of the book (that is, the complainant's publisher). The complainant asked [REDACTED] to intervene but [REDACTED] would have refused to delete information on the ground that it has to maintain the sheet product for second-hand versions."*

4. In essence, the complainant asked the CNPD to request [REDACTED] to delete his personal data.
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 to provide a detailed description of the issue relating to the processing of the complainant's personal data, in particular with regard to his request for erasure. Moreover, the CNPD required [REDACTED] to proceed to the deletion of the complainant's personal data as soon as possible, unless legal reasons prevent the former from doing so.
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. 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.
10. Furthermore, in application of Article 12(2) GDPR *"the controller shall facilitate the exercise of data subject rights under Articles 15 to 22"*. Recital 59 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.”*

11. Article 12(4) GDPR provides that *“If the controller does not take action on the request of the data subject, the controller shall inform the data subject without delay and at the latest within one month of receipt of the request of the reasons for not taking action and on the possibility of lodging a complaint with a supervisory authority and seeking a judicial remedy.”*
12. 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”;*
13. 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”;*
14. 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**

15. Following the intervention of the Luxembourg supervisory authority, the controller has demonstrated:
  - That the detail page of the complainant's book [BOOK] and the information on his biography were removed. For clarification, the request of removal of the product detail page of the book made by the complainant is not a request for erasure under article 17 (1) GDPR since it informs about the general characteristics of the book, in particular, title of the book, image of the book, name of the author, ISBN number, publisher, publishing date and the purchase price. This is information released to the public by the complainant and/or his former publisher, [PUBLISHER], for the purpose of commercially trading this book. The



**Deliberation No 51\_RECL42\_2025 of 23 April 2025 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file No 4.187 lodged against the company [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 62996**

information is currently available in library catalogues and ISBN databases.

- That, after consideration, the exercised right has nonetheless *de facto* been attended by the controller.

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

16. 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.
17. 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.
18. The CNPD then consulted the supervisory authority of France, pursuant to Article 60(1), whether it agreed to close the case. The Supervisory Authority of France has responded affirmatively, so that 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 4.187 upon completion of its investigation, in accordance with the Complaints Procedure before the CNPD and after obtaining the agreement of the concerned supervisory authority. 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

[REDACTED]  
Commissioner

[REDACTED]  
Commissioner



**Deliberation No 51\_RECL42\_2025 of 23 April 2025 of the National Data Protection Commission, in a plenary session, on complaint file No 4.187 lodged against the company [REDACTED] via IMI Article 61 procedure 62996**

### **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.