

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

7 January 2026

J.No. 2025-7321-1645

Doc.no. 789071

Caseworker

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent by Digital Post

Final Decision in your case regarding Conrad Elektronik Norden AB

1. Introductory remarks

On 20 December 2024, you made a complaint about Conrad Elektronik Norden AB (Conrad Elektronik) to the Danish Data Protection Agency (the Danish DPA). On 12 June 2025 you forwarded your correspondence with Conrad Elektronik.

The Danish DPA considered that the specific case involved cross-border processing of personal data, which means that your case has been handled in cooperation with other EU supervisory authorities.

As part of the cross-border cooperation mechanism cases, the Danish DPA submitted the case to the other EU supervisory authorities on 18 February 2025. The Swedish supervisory authority, Integritetsskyddsmyndigheten (IMY), was appointed as lead supervisory authority in accordance with article 56 of the General Data Protection Regulation¹ (hereinafter GDPR), because Conrad Elektronik's main establishment is in Sweden.

The Danish DPA hereby adopts the Swedish supervisory authority's decision, cf. GDPR article 60(8).

2. The facts of the case

Overall, you have stated in your complaint of 20 December 2024 that you purchased something from Conrad Elektronik in 2022 and that you have since then received e-mails from the company when your colleagues have not paid their bills. You have informed that you have asked Conrad Elektronik not to contact you regarding other people's purchases and that you have twice requested the company to erase your personal data. You have informed that Conrad Elektronik has not complied with your requests for erasure.

Conrad Elektronik has stated that it has received your request for erasure and removed your e-mail from its systems. However, the company had missed a place where your e-mail was indicated as the recipient of invoices in the company's systems. Conrad Elektronik erased your personal data from their systems on 3 July 2025.

**The Danish Data
Protection Agency**
Carl Jacobsens Vej 35
2500 Valby
Denmark
T 3319 3200
dt@datatilsynet.dk
datatilsynet.dk

VAT No. 11883729

¹ 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 (General Data Protection Regulation)

On 23 July 2025 you responded to Conrad Elektronik's statement regarding the case. You have stated that you have previously been contacted by Conrad Electroinic even though you had been informed that your personal data had been erased. You therefore hope it is true that Conrad Elektronik has finally erased your personal data.

3. Reasons given by the Swedish supervisory authority (IMY)

The right to erasure is regulated in Article 17 of the GDPR. The provision entails that if certain conditions in the provision are met, the data subject has the right to the erasure of his or her personal data.

It follows from article 57(1)(f) of the GDPR that the supervisory authority handles complaints lodged by data subjects, and, to the extent appropriate, examines the subject matter of the complaint.

IMY has – as the lead supervisory authority – considerable scope to assess the extent to which a complaint should be investigated and which investigative measures are necessary and appropriate in the individual case. In this case, IMY has asked Conrad Elektronik for a statement and given you the opportunity to comment on the statement.

Conrad Elektronik has informed IMY that it has now deleted your personal data. In response to this, you have stated that the company has previously informed that it had deleted your data, which turned out not to be true. You therefore hope it is true when Conrad Elektronik has informed that your personal data has now been erased from their systems.

IMY has considered that your case has been sufficiently investigated. IMY has found that your arguments have not called for further investigation, as it is the assessment of IMY that such an investigation does not appear to be proportionate to the nature of the case. IMY has investigated the case to the extent appropriate required by Article 57(1)(f) of the GDPR.

4. Concluding remarks

On the basis of the above, the Danish DPA considers the case closed and does not take any further action in relation to your complaint.

Decisions of the Danish DPA may not be appealed to any other administrative authority, cf. Section 30 of the Data Protection Act. However, the decisions of the Danish DPA may be challenged before the courts, cf. Section 63 of the Constitution.

Kind regards,

