

□ Procedure No.: PS/00157/2020

## RESOLUTION OF PUNISHMENT PROCEDURE

Of the procedure instructed by the Spanish Agency for Data Protection and based on  
to the following

### FACTS

FIRST: The entity COMMUNITY OF OWNERS \*\*\*COMMUNITY.1 (\*in  
hereinafter, the claimant) on January 21, 2020 filed a claim with the  
Spanish Data Protection Agency. The claim is directed against CITRICOS  
AND FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L. with CIF B23719743 (hereinafter, the claimed)  
for the installation of a video surveillance system in the street \*\*\*ADDRESS.1,

\*\*\*LOCATION.1. The grounds on which the claim is based are as follows:

“[...] II. The Citricos y Frutales del Sureste company has installed a set of  
video surveillance cameras in the common areas of the enclosure, without the installation of  
they were approved by agreement of the Board of Owners. And it is not only  
has not been approved by the Board, but the proposal to install the cameras has not  
has been an item on the agenda of none of the Meetings. Therefore, the community  
Owners Building Poseidon, is totally unrelated to the facility that of the  
CCTV cameras have been made on the premises.

III. The installation of the cameras without the express consent of the owners who  
form the Board of the building has violated the Horizontal Property Law so much, that  
establishes in its article 17 that it must be the Board of Owners by majority  
qualified person who makes decisions regarding surveillance of any kind, also in  
the installation of cameras, such as the Organic Law on the Protection of Character Data  
Personal, whose article 6.1 determines that the residents, as affected, must  
grant your unequivocal consent for the processing of your personal data.

IV. The video surveillance cameras are located in the common areas of the building, recording the corridors and the entrance doors to the rooms, as well as in the area from the community pool and at the entrance of it.

V. There are no signs reporting access to a video-monitored area, which excludes in turn, all kinds of information about the identity of the person responsible for the installation, as well as where to go to exercise the rights provided by the regulations of data protection.

SAW. Since there are workers in the building, it is possible that they in turn are using the cameras to control the workers who work at the reception, the cleaning staff, the concierge / s, and the waiters of the beach bar that exists in the pool area, among others, without complying with the requirements regarding cameras for business control, given the evident absence of information signs in the areas guarded.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

2/13

SAW. Given the arrangement of the cameras, it is possible that images are being captured, both from the public highway and from the adjoining building. [...]”.

Attach photographs of cameras placed in outdoor community areas.

SECOND: Prior to admitting this claim for processing, the

Subdirector General for Data Inspection sent the respondent a request for information on February 19, 2020.

The respondent filed a reply brief stating succinctly what

Next:

“[...] That CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L. carries out the provision of tourist accommodation services in apartments, focusing said activity in the so-called APARTAMENTOS \*\*\*APARTAMENTOS.1, which is correspond to the indicated address.

That said apartment building has common areas with a swimming pool, bar, playgrounds, terrace, dining room, etc. Like any apartment complex.

That, given that the property can be accessed from the outside, and that any stranger to the property and the company could access the common areas and that in these areas there are elements that could be of interest to the friends of alien, it was decided to hire a surveillance service with a company of recognized prestige.

That said surveillance service is duly installed and warned to the general public and users and workers of the establishment.

That the entity \*\*\*ENTITY.1 is in charge of carrying out the activity of contracted surveillance, which it executes with its own specialized teams, in the 2 locations chosen by its technical staff, as it deems most suitable for the provision of the contracted service.

That it is the staff of \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 that has access to the images taken as a consequence of the execution of the contracted video surveillance service.

That, as regards the time and place of maintenance of the recordings, it is \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 the only one in charge and responsible for said aspects.

That the entity's workers are duly informed of the hiring of a video surveillance service of common areas, and the installation of cameras, because it has never been hidden and everything is duly warned.

That, in proof of all this, photographs of advertising posters of the existence of cameras. [...]”

Attach the following documents:

1.

Poster of the company \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 related to alarm signaling

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

3/13

1.

Informative video surveillance poster with reference to Law 15/1999 and mentioning that the exercise of rights can be done at [securitasdiret.es](http://securitasdiret.es)

[Sic.]

THIRD: The Director of the Spanish Protection Agency agreed to admit

Process the claim on June 1, 2020.

FOURTH: On October 13, 2020, a letter is received from the respondent providing type of information offered by \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 about different camera models and storage in the cloud of information depending on each type of model.

Attach the following documents:

1.

A certificate issued by Logalty about the existence of a contract signed between \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 and A.A.A. (administrator of the claimed entity). Nope the content of the contract is provided.

Photographs of two installed cameras, as well as control elements of

1.

these. No location reference is provided.

In the letter he refers to the provision of other documents that, however,

have not been sent:

1. Communication to workers.

1. Photographs of informative posters

FIFTH: On November 3, 2020, the Director of the Spanish Agency for

Data Protection agreed to initiate a sanctioning procedure against the claimant, with

in accordance with the provisions of articles 63 and 64 of the LPACAP, for the alleged infringement

of articles 5.1.c) and 13 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Regulation of

Data Protection, hereinafter RGPD), typified in article 83.5 of the aforementioned

rule.

SIXTH: The electronic notification of the initiation agreement was made available to the

claimed on November 4, 2020 through the Notification Service

Electronic and Enabled Electronic Address without the former accessing its content

within 10 calendar days. In accordance with the provisions of article 43.2 of the

LPACAP, the aforementioned notification must be understood as rejected.

SEVENTH: On 04/24/20, allegations are received from the respondent stating the

Next:

“That CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L. carries out the service

of tourist accommodation services in apartments, focusing this activity on

called APARTAMENTOS \*\*\*APARTAMENTOS.1, which correspond to the

indicated address.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

4/13

That the entity \*\*\*ENTITY.1 is in charge of carrying out the activity of

contracted surveillance, which it executes with its own specialized teams, in the 2 locations chosen by its technical staff, as it deems most suitable for the provision of the contracted service.

That the entity's workers are duly informed of the hiring of a video surveillance service of common areas, and the installation of cameras, because it has never been hidden and everything is duly warned.

That, in proof of all this, photographs of advertising posters of the existence of cameras.

EIGHTH: On 10/13/20 a new letter of allegations is received from the entity-

CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L.—stating the following:

“In the event that the CLIENT acquires one of the cameras (hereinafter, video surveillance system or camera) described in this CONTRACT,

The conditions described in this clause will apply.

That, in proof of all this, the following documentation is provided:

\*Photographs of posters announcing the existence of cameras.

\*Photographs of the cameras and installed systems and their situation.

\*Copy of communication document to workers.

\*Contract with Securitas Direct.

NINTH: On 01/04/21, in the testing phase, a request for information to the security company \*\*\*ENTITY.1.

TENTH: On 01/15/21 a reply is received from the security company \*\*\*ENTITY.1.

“In relation to this first request, this party wishes to highlight first of all that \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 is a company that provides installation services and maintenance of security systems, as well as the operation of power stations alarm that is subject to private security regulations. Therefore, and

in the event that the location indicated by the Agency in its request is  
would have installed a 24x7 video surveillance system with closed circuit television  
(CCTV), for the control of access to the building, my client does not provide that typology  
video surveillance service.

Apart from this scenario, the images or, where appropriate, videos that are collected through  
through the devices, when an alarm has been contracted with capture of  
image or video and it is not connected to the alarm receiving center,  
They are managed solely and exclusively by the client.

ELEVENTH: On 01/26/21 the Security Company is informed

\*\*\*ENTITY.1 of the location of the video surveillance cameras.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

5/13

TWELFTH: On 01/29/21 a letter of allegations is received from the Company

\*\*\*ENTITY.1.

“Once the facilities located on \*\*\*ADDRESS.1 Street have been analyzed, although  
none is owned by the establishment Apartamentos \*\*\*APARTAMENTOS.1, yes  
we have located that, in apartment 17A of the aforementioned street, and within the  
indicated urbanization, we have identified a facility, active since 1  
September 2020 in the name of Don “B.B.B.”.

In said dwelling there are only indoor devices installed, specifically two  
“photo detectors”, which only take photos in the event of an intrusion into the home if the  
alarm is connected, and a magnetic device, which detects only opening  
of doors and windows (does not take photos or video) when the alarm is armed. By

Therefore, in this installation, \*\*\*ENTITY.1 has not installed any video camera, reiterating that the devices that take pictures and that are part of the installation are located inside the house.

As already indicated in the previous writing, once the installation of the system of security in the client's home, the management of the same corresponds to the client, except at the moment in which the client connects the alarm, in which case, it is connected to our alarm receiving center in such a way that if an alarm occurs intrusion into the client's home we receive a signal, as well as the images associated with it, to carry out the corresponding verification and, in the event that that an intrusion is confirmed, inform both the client and the state security forces and bodies.

In view of everything that has been done, by the Spanish Data Protection Agency

In this proceeding, the following are considered proven facts:

#### PROVEN FACTS

First. The facts bring cause of the claim dated 01/21/20 through the which denounces the installation of a video-surveillance camera system without have the authorization of the Board of Owners "affecting common areas" and with insufficient information about it.

Second. The entity Cítricos y

Frutales del Southeast, which does not deny having installed the system, although it does not have with the authorization of the Board of Owners.

Third. That the system has been installed by the security company \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 being the same ones that have access to the images captured by the system.

It provides a sign indicating that the person in charge of the installation is

\*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 (photo Annex I), as well as another with reference to the repealed LOPD, indicating the exercise of the right before \*\*\*ENTITY.1 (Doc. No. 2 Annex I Written date



04/24/20).

Fourth. The company \*\*\*ENTIDAD.1 in relation to the installed cameras states that following in a letter dated 01/15/21 "Apart from that scenario, the images or,

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

6/13

in your case videos that are collected through the devices, when it has been contracted an alarm with image or video capture and it is not found connected to the alarm receiving center, are managed solely and exclusively for the client".

## FOUNDATIONS OF LAW

Yo

By virtue of the powers that article 58.2 Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (Regulation General Data Protection, hereinafter RGPD) recognizes each authority of control, and as established in articles 47 and 48 of Organic Law 3/2018, of 5 December, Protection of Personal Data and guarantee of digital rights (hereinafter, LOPDGDD), the Director of the Spanish Agency for the Protection of Data is competent to initiate and resolve this procedure.

II

Article 6.1 of the RGPD establishes the assumptions that allow the legalization of the treatment of personal data.

For its part, article 5.1.c) of the RGPD, regarding the principles of treatment, provides that personal data will be "adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary in relation to the purposes for which they are processed ("minimization of

data")." This article enshrines the principle of data minimization in the treatment of personal data. It assumes that said treatment is adjusted and proportional to the purpose to which it is directed, and the processing of data must be restricted excessive or proceed to suppress them.

The relevance in the processing of the data must occur both in the field of collection of the data as well as in the subsequent treatment that is carried out on them.

On the other hand, in accordance with the provisions of article 22 of the LOPDGDD, referred to specifically to "Processing for video surveillance purposes", the processing of images in public places can only be made -if applicable and prior to the compliance with the legally enforceable requirements-, by the Forces and Bodies of Security, unless the exception established in the aforementioned article 22 of the LOPDGDD for individuals or legal entities, public or private, respecting the conditions required in said article.

On some occasions, the protection of private spaces is only possible if the cameras are located in spaces such as facades. Sometimes it is also necessary capture the accesses, doors or entrances, so that, even if the camera is inside the building, it is impossible not to record a minimum and essential of the public road, which is inevitably captured.

For this exception on the protection of private spaces to be applicable, There must be an alternative installation possibility. In these cases, the responsible

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

7/13

of the treatment carried out through cameras will adapt the use of the installation,

so that the impact on the rights of third parties (passers-by) is the minimum possible.

In no case will the use of surveillance practices beyond the environment be allowed.

object of the installation, not being able to affect the surrounding public spaces,

adjoining buildings and vehicles other than those accessing the guarded space

### III

In accordance with the foregoing, the processing of images through a system

of video surveillance, to be in accordance with current regulations, must comply with the

following requirements:

- Respect the principle of proportionality.

- When the system is connected to an alarm center, it can only be

installed by a private security company that meets the requirements

contemplated in article 5 of Law 5/2014 on Private Security, of April 4.

- Access to camera images by third parties other than the

responsible for the treatment must be regulated by the existence of a contract.

- The video cameras will not be able to capture images of people who are

outside the private space where the video surveillance system is installed, since

the treatment of images in public places can only be carried out, unless

Government authorization concurs, by the Security Forces and Bodies. Either

spaces owned by third parties may be captured or recorded without the consent of

their owners, or, where appropriate, of the people who are in them.

This rule admits some exceptions since, on some occasions, for the protection

of private spaces, where cameras have been installed on facades or inside,

it may be necessary to guarantee the security purpose the recording of a

portion of public road. That is, cameras and video cameras installed for the purpose of

security will not be able to obtain images of public roads unless it is

essential for said purpose, or it is impossible to avoid it due to the location of

those and, extraordinarily, the minimum space for said

purpose. Therefore, the cameras could exceptionally capture the portion

minimally necessary for the intended security purpose.

- The duty to inform those affected provided for in articles 12 and

13 GDPR

Specifically, in accordance with article 22.4 of the LOPDGDD, it must be placed in

video-monitored areas, at least one informative sign located in a place

sufficiently visible, both in open and closed spaces, in which

will identify, at least, the existence of a treatment, the identity of the person in charge and the

possibility of exercising the rights provided for in said precepts. Also, you must

keep available to those affected the information referred to in the aforementioned

GDPR.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

8/13

- The person in charge must keep a record of treatment activities

carried out under its responsibility, including the information to which it makes

reference article 30.1 of the RGPD.

- Installed cameras cannot get images from third-party proprietary space

and/or public space without duly accredited justified cause, nor can they affect

the privacy of passers-by who move freely through the area. not allowed, for

Therefore, the placement of cameras towards the private property of neighbors with the purpose

to intimidate them or affect their privacy without just cause.

- In no case will the use of surveillance practices beyond the environment be admitted.

object of the installation and in particular, not being able to affect public spaces surrounding buildings, adjoining buildings and vehicles other than those accessing the space guarded.

In relation to the above, to facilitate the consultation of interested parties, the Agency

Spanish Data Protection offers through its website

[<https://www.aepd.es>] access to data protection legislation

including the RGPD and the LOPDGDD (section “Reports and resolutions” /

“normative”), as well as the Guide on the use of video cameras for security and other

purposes, as well as the Guide for compliance with the duty to inform (both

available in the “Guides and tools” section).

It is also of interest, in the event of carrying out low-risk data processing, the

facilitates free tool (in the “Guides and tools” section), which, through

specific questions, allows to assess the situation of the person in charge with respect to the

treatment of personal data that it carries out, and where appropriate, generate various

documents, informative and contractual clauses, as well as an annex with measures

guidelines considered minimum.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

9/13

IV

The claim is based on the alleged illegality of the installation, by the

claimed, of a video surveillance system composed of several cameras located

in the common areas of the building located on the street

\*\*\*ADDRESS 1

(\*\*\*LOCATION.1).

As proof of these statements, the claimant provided the photographs to which reference has been made in the first fact of this agreement.

Thus, in the images provided, the existence of several cameras located in the common elements of the building that would be oriented towards common areas of the property and can even capture images of neighboring buildings. To this In this regard, the photographs provided by the respondent in the answers to the requests for information do not provide information on the field of vision of the cameras placed. On the other hand, the photograph of the informative poster provided in

The first answer sent by the respondent shows that he did not is adapted to the RGPD in the manner provided in article 22.4 of the LOPDGDD.

As far as the responsibility of the treatment is concerned, it is considered that, in accordance with article 4.7 of the RGPD, which defines as responsible whoever determines the purposes and means of treatment, the claimed party is the one who holds said condition, since, as The owner of the video surveillance system is the one who makes the decisions about the installation of the video surveillance system, without having accredited a delegation in other persons, individuals or legal entities, in the determination of the ends and means.

v

The corrective powers available to the Spanish Agency for the Protection of Data, as a control authority, is established in article 58.2 of the RGPD. Among they have the power to issue a warning -article 58.2 b)-, the power to impose an administrative fine in accordance with article 83 of the RGPD -article 58.2 i)-, or the power to order the controller or processor that the treatment operations comply with the provisions of the RGPD, when appropriate, in a certain way and within a specified period -article 58. 2

d)-.

According to the provisions of article 83.2 of the RGPD, the measure provided for in article 58.2

d) of the aforementioned Regulation is compatible with the sanction consisting of a fine administrative.

SAW

In accordance with the evidence available in this proceeding

sanctioning party, it is considered that the exposed facts do not comply with what is established in the articles 5.1.c) and 13 of the RGPD, so we are facing the commission of

respective infractions typified in article 83.5 of the RGPD, which provides the following:

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

10/13

“The infractions of the following dispositions will be sanctioned, in accordance with the

paragraph 2, with administrative fines of a maximum of EUR 20,000,000 or,

in the case of a company, an amount equivalent to a maximum of 4% of the

global total annual turnover of the previous financial year, opting for

the largest amount:

the basic principles for the treatment, including the conditions for the

a)

consent under articles 5, 6, 7 and 9;

a)

the rights of the interested parties under articles 12 to 22; [...]”.

For the purposes of the limitation period for infringements, article 72.1 of the

LOPDGDD, which establishes that:

“Based on the provisions of article 83.5 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, considered very serious and will prescribe after three years the infractions that suppose a substantial violation of the articles mentioned therein and, in particular, the following:

a) The processing of personal data violating the principles and guarantees established in article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. [...]

On the other hand, article 74 of the RGPD provides that:

“They are considered minor and the remaining infractions of a legal nature will prescribe after a year. merely formal of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 4 and 5 of article 83 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and, in particular, the following:

[...] a) Failure to comply with the principle of transparency of information or the right to information of the affected party for not providing all the information required by the Articles 13 and 14 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. [...]”.

The defendant has a video-surveillance camera system that has been installed in common areas without the mandatory consent of the Community of owners, carrying out unnecessary data processing of other owners who have not given their consent in this regard, regardless of the fact that the evidence provided are considered insufficient to prove her innocence.

The areas captured by the denounced system allow the “treatment of data” of the neighbors of the property who are intimidated by the system by being excessive capturing of images, apart from considerations that could be incardinated in the LPH (vgr. 17.3 LPH).

Furthermore, the orientation angle of the cameras allows verify an excessive uptake towards areas outside the Community itself, such as would be the parking area located at the entrance, so it is inferred that the system exceeds of the main function that at most would be limited to access control to the



establishment that he runs, therefore limiting himself to the potential clients of the same.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

11/13

Likewise, the informative poster mentions a regulation currently repealed, as is the LOPD, only formally mentioning the company

\*\*\* ENTITY.1 as data controller, although it is not the main responsible for the destination or purpose of the processed images, but a mere installer of the system in question.

7th

In the present case, it is considered that the corresponding sanction to be imposed is that of administrative fine. In this regard, the fine imposed must be, in each individual case, effective, proportionate and dissuasive, in accordance with the provisions of the article 83.1 of the RGPD. Therefore, it is appropriate to graduate the sanction to be imposed in accordance with the criteria established in article 83.2 of the RGPD, and with the provisions of the Article 76 of the LOPDGDD, with respect to section k) of the aforementioned article 83.2 RGPD:

The following aggravating circumstance has been taken into account in the initial assessment:

-the nature, seriousness and duration of the offence, taking into account the nature, scope or purpose of the processing operation in question as well such as the number of interested parties affected and the level of damages that have suffered; (art. 83.2 a) RGPD).

-The intention or negligence in the infringement (article 83.2.b) of the RGPD).

The installed cameras affect the transit area of neighbors of the property that is

are affected in their personal data, being apart from other considerations a disproportionate treatment by not being limited to the area of use of the establishment managed hotelier, being therefore controlled in their daily chores with non-security purposes.

In addition, the following mitigating circumstance has been taken into account:

☐ It is a small company whose main activity is not linked to the processing of personal data (article 76.2.b) of the LOPDGDD).

Based on the foregoing, and taking into account that the net amount of turnover that appears in the last annual accounts presented corresponding to 2017 was of €939,522.22, it is considered proportional to set the penalty to be imposed in the amount of TWO THOUSAND EUROS (€2,000) for the infringement of article 5.1.c) of the RGPD and THOUSAND EUROS (€1,000) for the infringement of article 13 of the RGPD, resulting in a total of THREE THOUSAND EUROS (€3,000).

Therefore, in accordance with the applicable legislation and having assessed the criteria for graduation of sanctions whose existence has been proven,

the Director of the Spanish Data Protection Agency RESOLVES:

FIRST: IMPOSE CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L., with CIF B23719743, for an infringement of Article 5.1.c) of the RGPD typified in Article 83.5 of the RGPD, a fine of €2,000 (Two thousand euros).

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

12/13

SECOND: IMPOSE CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L., with CIF B23719743, for an infringement of article 13 of the RGPD typified in Article 83.5

of the RGPD, a fine of €1,000 (one thousand euros).

THIRD: ORDER the entity CITRICOS Y FRUTALES DEL SURESTE, S.L.,

in accordance with article 58.2 RGPD, so that within 1 month from the

notification of this act proceed to:

☐ Provide the images that are observed with the device in question, indicating

in a location plan the parts that correspond to your property

particular.

☐ Prove that you keep the information to which it refers available to those affected.

refers to the aforementioned RGPD.

☐ Prove that you have authorization from the community board of

owners for the installation of video surveillance devices with

orientation towards the outside of the private space.

☐ Prove, if there is access to the images by third parties other than the

responsible for the treatment, the content of the contract in which

establish the object, the duration, the nature and purpose of the treatment, the

type of personal data and categories of interested parties, and the obligations and

rights of the person in charge. The content of the contract must be in accordance with

provided in article 28.3 of the RGPD.

FOURTH: NOTIFY this resolution to the entity CITRICOS Y FRUTALES

DEL SURESTE, S.L. and REPORT the result of the proceedings to the claimant

COMMUNITY OF OWNERS \*\*\* COMMUNITY.1.

FIFTH: Warn the sanctioned party that he must make the imposed sanction effective once

Once this resolution is enforceable, in accordance with the provisions of the

art. 98.1.b) of Law 39/2015, of October 1, on Administrative Procedure

Common Public Administrations (hereinafter LPACAP), within the payment term

voluntary established in art. 68 of the General Collection Regulations, approved

by Royal Decree 939/2005, of July 29, in relation to art. 62 of Law 58/2003, of December 17, through its entry, indicating the NIF of the sanctioned and the number of procedure that appears in the heading of this document, in the account restricted number ES00 0000 0000 0000 0000 0000, opened on behalf of the Agency Spanish Department of Data Protection in the banking entity CAIXABANK, S.A.. In case Otherwise, it will be collected in the executive period.

Received the notification and once executed, if the date of execution is between the 1st and 15th of each month, both inclusive, the term to make the payment voluntary will be until the 20th day of the following month or immediately after, and if between the 16th and last day of each month, both inclusive, the payment term It will be until the 5th of the second following month or immediately after.

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](http://sedeagpd.gob.es)

13/13

In accordance with the provisions of article 50 of the LOPDGDD, this

Resolution will be made public once it has been notified to the interested parties.

Against this resolution, which puts an end to the administrative procedure in accordance with art. 48.6 of the LOPDGDD, and in accordance with the provisions of article 123 of the LPACAP, the

Interested parties may optionally file an appeal for reconsideration before the

Director of the Spanish Agency for Data Protection within a month from

counting from the day following the notification of this resolution or directly

contentious-administrative appeal before the Contentious-Administrative Chamber of the

National Court, in accordance with the provisions of article 25 and section 5 of

the fourth additional provision of Law 29/1998, of July 13, regulating the

Contentious-administrative jurisdiction, within a period of two months from the day following the notification of this act, as provided in article 46.1 of the aforementioned Law.

Finally, it is pointed out that in accordance with the provisions of art. 90.3 a) of the LPACAP, may provisionally suspend the firm resolution in administrative proceedings if the The interested party expresses his intention to file a contentious-administrative appeal.

If this is the case, the interested party must formally communicate this fact by writing addressed to the Spanish Agency for Data Protection, presenting it through Electronic Register of the Agency [<https://sedeagpd.gob.es/sede-electronica-web/>], or through any of the other registers provided for in art. 16.4 of the aforementioned Law 39/2015, of October 1. You must also transfer to the Agency the documentation proving the effective filing of the contentious appeal-administrative. If the Agency was not aware of the filing of the appeal contentious-administrative within a period of two months from the day following the notification of this resolution would end the precautionary suspension.

Sea Spain Marti

Director of the Spanish Data Protection Agency

938-131120

C/ Jorge Juan, 6

28001 – Madrid

[www.aepd.es](http://www.aepd.es)

[sedeagpd.gob.es](https://sedeagpd.gob.es)