



REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA
DATA PROTECTION INSPECTORATE

/*FOR INTERNAL USE

Holder of information: Data Protection Inspectorate

Notation made: 03.03.2026

The access restriction shall be valid until: 03.03.2101,

Legal ground: AvTS § 35 lg 1 p 12, AvTS § 35 lg 1 p 2 *

Re p 2 – until entry into force of the Final Decision

SA Lithuania
All CSA-s

Ours 03.03.2026 nr 2.1-12/25/1518-3262-5

Article 60 Draft Decision Termination of supervisory proceedings

The Estonian Data Protection Inspectorate (DPI) received a complaint from Lithuanian citizen [REDACTED] (the Complainant) via the IMI cross-border procedural system against [REDACTED] ([REDACTED], the Controller). According to the complaint, the Controller did not properly comply with the Complainant's request under Article 15 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which the Complainant submitted to [REDACTED] on 22 September 2025.

Since [REDACTED] is an Estonian company, its management board is located in Estonia, and all decisions concerning data processing are taken in Estonia, the Estonian DPI agreed to act as the lead supervisory authority in the case and commenced supervisory proceedings based on the complaint.

Circumstances of the complaint

The Complainant is a [REDACTED] driver and received a message from [REDACTED] informing him that he had a logo of another company on his car. Since the Complainant had not served any of [REDACTED]'s customers for several weeks, he wondered how had [REDACTED] received such information about his car or who had communicated it to [REDACTED]. The Complainant contacted [REDACTED] twice by e-mail (from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] – the second time pointing out that he wanted information about the processing of his personal data under Article 15 GDPR, but [REDACTED] did not provide the information requested. More specifically, the Complainant wanted to know which specific personal data [REDACTED] had collected about the Complainant in connection with that case; from where had [REDACTED] obtained information about the sticker on Complainant's car; how and where had his car been photographed and by whom (either the company or by a private individual). In addition, the Complainant wished to obtain a copy of that photograph of his car.

On the basis of Section 56(3)(8) of the Personal Data Protection Act, the DPI initiated supervisory proceedings and instructed [REDACTED] to respond to the Complainant's request under Article 15 of the GDPR in an appropriate manner and to provide the requested information about the processing of his personal data (source of the photo; the manner and place in which the photograph was taken; copy of the photo) to the e-mail address [REDACTED] as soon as possible but not later than 12.11.2025. By the same date, the DPI also ordered [REDACTED] to explain why had [REDACTED] so far failed to deal properly with the Complainant's application.

Explanations provided by the Controller

■■■ confirmed that it had received a notification from the Complainant on 22 September 2025, according to which the use of the Complainant's vehicle on the ■■■ platform had been temporarily suspended because the vehicle had competitor stickers on it. The Complainant subsequently stated in his second e-mail, that his letter constituted an application under Article 15 of the GDPR. Due to a procedural error, the Complainant's request was not escalated to ■■■'s privacy team. The initial message was handled by a team whose main task is to deal with operational queries rather than data subjects' requests. ■■■ admits that, as a result, the Complainant was not given a full reply pursuant to Article 15 of the GDPR within the statutory time limit. After that, ■■■ informed his team about the correct procedure to escalate such requests.

As regards to the facts of the complaint, ■■■ explains the following:

- On 22 September 2025, an employee of ■■■ Lithuania personally spotted in Vilnius a vehicle registered on the Complainant's ■■■ platform with stickers bearing a competitor's brand.
- The observation was made in a public place during a routine compliance check.
- No photographs were taken of the vehicle, no third-party reports or automated systems were used.
- Observation data was stored in an internal log containing the following fields: the vehicle registration number, the platform registration confirmation, the activity status, the date when the vehicle was last seen with stickers, and the status of the vehicle.
- On 5 November 2025, a vehicle with stickers of the same competitor's brand was accidentally spotted again in Vilnius.

On 12 December 2025, ■■■ provided the Complainant with a reply to his data subject's request. The reply confirmed the processing of personal data and explained how the survey was carried out. The reply also stated that there was no photographic record of the vehicle.¹ According to ■■■, the Complainant's application has now been answered in full and in accordance with the requirements of Article 15 of the GDPR. The Complainant has received an exhaustive reply and no photographic records or additional personal data have been collected when monitoring his vehicle.

Assessment of the Estonian Data Protection Inspectorate

Personal data means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person; an identifiable natural person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, by reference to one or more identifiers (Article 4(1) GDPR). In the present case, the Complainant argued that the personal data consisted of a photograph of his car, since that photo is linked with the Complainant's ■■■'s account. The Complainant requested information about the processing of his personal data and a copy of the photograph.

Pursuant to Article 15 GDPR, the data subject has the right to obtain from the data Controller confirmation as to whether his or her personal data are being processed and, if so, the right to access his or her personal data and the information listed in Article 15(1) GDPR, including the purpose of the processing (a); the type of personal data (b); where personal data are not collected from the data subject, available information about their source (g) etc. The provision of a copy of the personal data processed is considered to be the main means of accessing the personal data pursuant to Article 15(3) GDPR. The Controller must take appropriate measures to ensure that the information provided to the data subject is complete, correct and up-to-date and corresponds as closely as possible to the state of processing at the time of receipt of the request. If the data Controller does not agree to provide the Complainant with information about the processing of his or her personal data, the data Controller must rely on a specific legal basis and justify this refusal.

¹ ■■■ provided the DPI with a copy of the reply sent to the Complainant.

On 22 September 2025, the Complainant first requested information from the data Controller about the mechanism by which the infringement was recorded (*What is the mechanism by which you noticed this*), to which [REDACTED] replied: *Please be informed that we had received information that a car registered in our system is marked with another company's signage.*

In the second complaint, the Complainant specifically asked for information on the processing of his personal data under Article 15 of the GDPR, but [REDACTED]'s reply was general: *Thank you for asking. If your car no longer carries a branded advertisement for another company, please send a photo of it with today's date visible on the car and you will be able to use the car again.*

The Controller infringed Article 15 GDPR by failing to provide the Complainant with proper information about the processing of his personal data. Although no photograph of the car was taken, [REDACTED] should have explained the processing to the Complainant. [REDACTED] explained in his response to the DPI that the Complainant had not been given a reply under Article 15 of the GDPR due to a procedural error and sent the Complainant a proper reply on 1. December 2025, where [REDACTED] explained to the Complainant that no photographs or videos had been taken of his vehicle; the information was not obtained automatically (e.g. via an app or camera) or provided by any third party. The information was recorded in the internal compliance log. A similar observation was registered on 5 November 2025 under the same circumstances. [REDACTED] provided the data subject with a copy of the relevant extract from [REDACTED]'s internal strike, containing information identifying the Complainant. The information was processed to ensure compliance with [REDACTED]'s drivers' general terms and conditions, which prohibit the driver from displaying a competitor's branding on a vehicle registered on the [REDACTED] platform when providing driving services using a [REDACTED] Driver account.

The DPI takes into account that the supervisory proceedings were based on an individual complaint by one data subject and that [REDACTED] has complied with the data subject's request in the course of the proceedings and provided the Complainant with the required information pursuant to Article 15 GDPR, therefore the infringement has ceased. The DPI also takes into account that [REDACTED] has cooperated with the DPI, acknowledged the error and informed its team of the correct procedure for handling such requests.

In conclusion, the Complainant ultimately received a reply to his request (although within more than 30 days as required by Article 12(3) GDPR). In the light of the above, and subject to the principle of proportionality, the DPI will not take corrective measures under Article 58 GDPR and will close the present supervisory proceedings.

This notice of termination of the supervision proceedings can be challenged within 30 days by submitting an appeal to the administrative court under the Code of Administrative Court Procedure.²

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]
lawyer
authorized by Director General

² [Code of Administrative Court Procedure–Riigi Teataja](#)