

Home » Practice » Decisions of the CPLD for 2022 » Decision on appeal with reg. No. PPN-02-343/21.08.2020 Decision on appeal with reg. No. PPN-02-343/21.08.2020 DECISION no. PPN-02-343/2020 Sofia, 12/01/2022 The Commission for the Protection of Personal Data (PCPD) composed of: Tsanko Tsolov, Maria Mateva and Veselin Tselkov at a meeting held on 17/11/2021, on the basis of Art. . 10, para. 1 of the Personal Data Protection Act in connection with Art. 57, § 1, letter "f" of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons in relation to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (Regulation , GDPR), examined the merits of complaint No. PPN-02-343/21.08.2020. The administrative proceedings are in accordance with Art. 38 of the Personal Data Protection Act (PAPA). The Commission for the Protection of Personal Data was referred to a complaint filed by Ya.B. with allegations of unlawful processing of personal data, in the hypothesis of video surveillance carried out by his brother R.B. in jointly owned property - a house located at the address of the city of S., used by both persons. He claims that the video surveillance is carried out without his knowledge and consent and in violation of his personal integrity. He is asking for an investigation into the case, specifying that video surveillance is carried out by five video surveillance cameras installed "alongside" the house and "in the common areas of the staircase." In addition, in a telephone conversation objectified in protocol PPN-02-343#1/21.10.2020, it is indicated that the house has three floors, of which he fully uses the third floor, the second floor is used by his brother, and the first floor is for common use. No evidence was attached to the complaint. According to the principles of equality of the parties in the proceedings and truthfulness, R.B. has been notified of the filed complaint, being given the opportunity to submit a written statement and relevant evidence. In order to clarify the case from a factual point of view, an inspection was carried out on the subject of the complaint, the results of which were objectified in a finding document PPN-02-333/29.06.2021, with attached Constitutive protocol of 10.06.2021, graphic images of camera locations and a completed questionnaire. The inspection was opened on 10.06.2021 at the address indicated in the complaint, with the delivery of the inspection order to L.B., son of R.B. From the inspection, the following was established: At the address indicated in the complaint, there is a piece of land in which a massive four-story residential building has been built - a house with one entrance and an adjoining yard. In front of the house, within the property, additional buildings (garages) were built, and the applicant is the owner of two of them, and R.B. is the owner of the third, on which a veranda with a roof structure (gazebo type) is built. The applicant Y.B. and his brother R.B. are co-owners of ½ (one second) ideal parts of the property, one apartment on the first floor and half of the rooms on the attic (fourth) floor of the building. The second floor is owned by R.B.

and is used by his son LB. and his family, and the third floor is owned by the applicant Ya.B. The house has a ground floor, which is also divided between the owners, as in its part R.B. has built a garage, which is accessed through a separate entrance to the property. It was established that a video surveillance system was built at the inspected site, consisting of five HIKVISION DS-2CD1331-I 3MP, 1/3" progressive scan CMOS, Up to 3.0 megapixel, 2.8 mm/4 mm/6 mm fixed focal lens , Up to 30 m IR range, Mobile monitoring via Hik-Connect or iVMS-4500 video cameras with sound recording capability, which at the time of the inspection are not connected to the electrical network and are not functioning. During the inspection, it was not established that the video cameras were connected to a recording device. LB was provided with a "Video Surveillance Inspection Questionnaire" to complete, which he completed in his own hand and handed over to the inspection team. From the information available in it, it is clear that at the address in the summer of 2019, in order to protect the property, a video surveillance system was built by LB, which, since its commissioning, functioned for about one or two months, after which the recording device was removed and connected to a video surveillance system building, built in another of his properties, again for security purposes, and the cameras of the inspected object are disconnected from the power grid. L.B. claims that the CCTV system was accessed remotely only by him, using a software application installed on his mobile phone. It was established that the inspected object is guarded in accordance with the Law on Private Security Activities by "V.S. EOOD, as the company does not have access to the video cameras and does not carry out video surveillance for the purpose of security of the property. The cameras are located and directed as follows: - Camera No. 1 is installed on the front facade, under the visor of the additional building (garage) used by R.B. and is directed to the approach to the additional building, the approach to the entrance to the internal garage used by him in the house, as well as part of the street and its adjacent sidewalks; - Camera No. 2 is located on the front facade, under the visor of the additional building (garage) used by R.B. on the opposite side of Camera No. 1 and facing the approach to the outbuilding, the approach to the outbuildings housing the appellant's two garages and to the common entrance to the property, as well as part of the street and its adjoining sidewalks; - Camera No. 3 is installed on the side facade of the additional building (garage) used by R.B. and is directed to his internal garage and the approach to it; - Camera No. 4 is located next to the internal garage of R.B. and is directed to the separate entrance to the property leading to it and a small part of the street; - Camera No. 5 is installed on the second floor of the house, above the entrance door of the apartment used by L.B. and is directed to the internal staircase of the house. The video surveillance system constructed in this way, even though it was not functioning at the time of the inspection, could be put back into

operation at any moment, allowing the identification of natural persons, but without the possibility of their facial recognition (through the use of a database with biometric data). . The categories of individuals whose personal data could be processed through the built-in video surveillance system are: residents and visitors to the property, as well as individuals passing by on the street and adjacent sidewalks. The inspection team found that there were no information stickers/signs warning about the implementation of video surveillance. In the course of the proceedings, after the inspection carried out by a team of the commission, R.B. informs that, after the inspection, he concluded a contract with the security company "S.1" for the security of the property and provides a copy of Annex No. 2/22.06.2021 signed by "S. " EOOD, as contractor, and "B. " Ltd. - contractor, represented by L.B., for the protection of a property located in the city of S. Given the information provided and attached evidence, by R.B. it is requested to specify whether the CCTV cameras are functioning after the inspection carried out on 10.06.2021 by a CPLD team, whether there has been a change in their scope and location, and to specify who has access to images/recordings from the CCTV cameras and how access is carried out . A certified copy of the concluded security contract is also required, insofar as only a copy of Annex No. 2/22.06.2021 to it was sent to the CPLD. In response and by letter PPN-02-343#6/16.09.2021, R.B. informs that after the commission's inspection the cameras are functioning, there is no change in their location and scope, and "only the security company has access to the cameras through video monitoring". Encloses a copy of contract No. 279478/21.12.2015, one with Annex No. 1 to it and a declaration, as well as Annex No. 2/22.06.2021. The Commission for the Protection of Personal Data is an independent state body that protects individuals in the processing of their personal data and in providing access to this data, as well as control of compliance with the GDPR and Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of April 27, 2016 on the protection of natural persons in connection with the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. In order to exercise its powers, the commission must be validly referred. The complaint must contain the required details, namely: there are data about the complainant, the nature of the request, date and signature, the person against whom it is filed is indicated, in order to make it regular. The subject of the complaint is the illegal processing of the personal data of the complainant, in the case of video surveillance in jointly owned property located in the city of S. The complaint was filed within the period under Art. 38 of the WPLD, insofar as it is not disputed that video surveillance was carried out before it was referred to the WPLD, and was carried out after 22.06.2021. Although the inspection by the CPLD found that as of 10.06.2021 video surveillance was not carried out, the passively legitimized party admits that video surveillance was carried out at the address before referral to the CPLD, within

a month or two after the installation of the cameras in the summer of 2019 and that after the date of an inspection carried out by the CPLD, the same was resumed. The complaint was filed by a natural person with a legal interest against a natural person who is claimed to be a personal data controller within the meaning of Art. 4, para. 7 EU Regulation 2016/679. In the course of the inspection, however, it was established that L.B. had access to the video surveillance carried out in 2019. - the son of the passively legitimized party, circumstances reflected in the findings of the inspection and completed by L.B. questionnaire, in view of which the same should participate in the proceedings as a respondent, ex officio constituted party. The file contains evidence of video surveillance carried out at the address from 22.06.2021, based on contract Annex No. 2/22.06.2021 for the security of a property located in the city of S., with parties "S. " EOOD - contractor, and "B. " Ltd. - contracting authority, represented by L.B. The subject of the contract is "24-hour signal-security activity for the protection of property, through monitoring and technical maintenance of the SIOS in the site and reaction with the MOP". In view of the latter and in view of the ex officio beginning, "S. " EOOD and "B. Ltd. There is no evidence that the company with the name "C.1" indicated by the passively legitimized party is related to the security contract, and it should be assumed that it is rather an error in indicating the name of the company, given the fact that in the attached contract the company, party to the contract, is "S." EOOD. Referred to is competent to rule - CPLD, which according to its powers under Art. 10, para. 1 of the Labor Code in connection with Art. 57, § 1, letter "f" of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, considers complaints against acts and actions of the controllers of personal data, which violate the rights of data subjects related to the processing of personal data, being not available the exceptions under Art. 2, § 2, letter "c" and Art. 55, § 3 of the regulation given the fact that the case does not concern processing activities carried out by an individual in the course of purely personal or domestic activities and/or activities carried out by the courts in the performance of their judicial functions. Based on the above considerations and given the absence of the negative prerequisites under Art. 27, para. 2 of the APC, at a meeting of the commission held on 29.09.2021, the complaint was accepted as admissible and the following were constituted as parties to the proceedings: complainant - Ya.B. and defendants - R.B. - passively legitimized and LB, "B. " Ltd. and "S. " EOOD - ex officio constituted. An open hearing has been scheduled to consider the merits of the appeal on 11/17/2021 at 1:00 p.m., of which the parties are regularly notified. They were informed about an official inspection regarding the video surveillance, objectified in a finding document with No. PPN-02-333/29.06.2021, a certified copy of which, together with its annexes, was provided to the parties for perusal. From "S. EOOD requested specific information and evidence about who has access to the video surveillance cameras, how access is

achieved, as well as graphic images from the video surveillance cameras and information on whether the video surveillance footage is recorded, for what period it is stored and who has access to him, were information signs placed on the site about the video surveillance being carried out, when and by whom. From the applicant, R.B. and L.B. a certified copy of a notarial deed for ownership of the property (with deleted personal data of persons other than those participating in the proceedings), respectively for the division of the yard, and a sketch of the property are requested. In response and with accompanying letter PPN-02-343#13/02.11.2021 R.B. submits a copy of sketch No. \*\*\* issued by AGKK, Office of Geodesy, Cartography and Cadastre for land property with identifier \*\*\* with address city of S., notarial deed establishing ownership right No. \*\*\*, notarial deed on immovable property property acquired under circumstantial inspection No. \*\*. and notarial deed for donation of real estate No. \*\*. In the course of the proceedings, a written opinion PPN-02-343#14/02.11.2021 was filed by L.B., with attached evidence related to it, namely a copy of - notarial deed for donation of real estate No. \*\* ; notarial deed for donation of real estate No. \*\* and Annex No. 2 dated 22.06.2021 to security agreement No. \*\* between "S.1" EOOD and "B. EOOD. L.B. contested the appeal as groundless. It informs that the cameras were installed in the summer of 2019 in order to protect the property from visitors and passers-by. He says that he owns a garage in the apartment building where he stores new car tires. He claims that the cameras were installed for security purposes and worked without a recording device for only about 3 /three/ months, and as of the date of the inspection carried out by the CPLD, they were not functioning. He claims that "S. " EOOD, with which "B." Ltd. has a fixed-term contract from 21.12.2015 and states that he and his family do not have access to them. A written opinion on the complaint was also expressed by "S. EOOD, filed with Reg. No. PPN-02-343#14/02.11.2021 with attached relevant evidence - graphic images of the output image from cameras 1, 2, 3 and 4 for video surveillance, the same from 11.11.2021 d. Output image from cameras 5 is not provided. They inform that "S. " EOOD carries out security with signal security systems for round-the-clock monitoring and response with armed mobile teams of a garage located at the address: \*\*, under contract No. \*\* dated 21.12.2015. with contracting authority "B. Ltd., concluded with one of the managers of the company, Mr. L.B. They add that on 22.06.2021, the service provided under the contract was changed by adding video surveillance of the object using 5 video cameras, a declaration of intent objectified in a new Appendix No. 1 to the contract. They claim that the cameras are the property of the contractor and were not installed and positioned by "C." Ltd. and specify that the company only provided a radio transmitter for connection with the duty center. They claim that the contractor under the security contract "B" has access to the video cameras. Ltd., through the representatives of the company, with its managers

deciding to whom to grant access. They specify that in this case, they provided "S." EOOD with a static IP address of the recording device (DVR), necessary to provide remote access to the National Duty Center of "S." /NODSHt to the records in the device, in case of violations detected by the alarm system in the protected object. They claim that "S. " EOOD uses the remote access to review the cameras automatically and in a very short time, only after receiving an alarm signal, by means of a software solution in the monitoring system of the NODC. Remote access can also be done manually, only when clarifying circumstances and actions of offenders or the company's mobile teams after a break-in and incidents in the objects, which have not happened before in this object. They claim that the recordings from the cameras are stored in the DVR device and are automatically deleted. They do not have information on how long they can be stored, since the company does not maintain the system and we do not have information about the volume of the recording device's memory. They add that the company did not put up information boards about the monitoring of object, since "S. " EOOD did not install the cameras and does not administer the video surveillance systems, as in only garage security stickers are provided to the depositor. They point out that the company is a commercial company whose main activity is the protection of the property of individuals and legal entities, for which it holds a license according to the Law on Private Security Activities /Z4OD/, where it is explicitly stated that security can also be carried out with the help of technical resources. In this regard, they consider that the provision of security services is lawful, with the requirements of the Polish Civil Service Act and in the presence of the conditions for the admissibility of the processing of personal data, insofar as the processing is necessary to protect the life and health of the natural persons, the object of the video surveillance and at the request of the assignor himself, and is necessary for the performance of the contract for the protection and guarantee of his security and property. They consider that the processing of personal data is necessary to realize the legitimate interests of the personal data controller, which in this case is a commercial company. They find the applicant's claims unfounded, probably due to a personal conflict. At an open meeting of the CPLD held on 17.11.2021, the complaint was examined on its merits. The parties - regularly notified, do not appear, do not represent themselves. In its capacity as an administrative body and in connection with the need to establish the truth of the case, as a basic principle in administrative proceedings, according to Art. 7 of the Administrative-Procedural Code, requiring the presence of established actual facts, taking into account the collected evidence and the statements made by the parties, the commission accepts that the substantively reviewed complaint No. PPN-02-343/21.08.2020 is partially justified. From the evidence collected in the file, it was established, and it is not disputed between the parties in the proceedings, that at an address in the city of S. there is a

piece of land in which a massive four-story residential building has been built - a house with one entrance and an adjoining yard. In front of the house, within the property, additional buildings (garages) were built, and it is not disputed that the appellant is the owner of two of them, and R.B. is the owner of the third, on which a veranda with a roof structure (gazebo type) is built. It is not disputed that the applicant Y.B. and his brother R.B. are co-owners of  $\frac{1}{2}$  (one second) ideal parts of the property, of one apartment on the first floor and half of the rooms on the attic (fourth) floor of the building. The second floor is owned by RB, but is used by his son LB. and his family. It is not in dispute that the third floor is owned by the applicant J.B. The house has a ground floor, which is undisputedly divided between the owners, as in its part R.B. has built a garage, which is accessed through a separate entrance to the property. Attached to the file are copies of notarial acts of ownership, which show the second floor, with an area of 109.55 sq. m., of the residential building - the house with identifier \*\*\* and a separate object with an area of 66.74 sq. m. second floor of a building with the identifier \*\*\*, located in the landed property, were donated to L.B. from his parents R.B. and V.B. Donated to L.B. from his parents is also an independent object - a "garage in a building" with the identifier \*\*\* and a built-up area of 41.76 square meters. The materials on the file testify that the massive four-story residential building - house is in condominium mode, insofar as there are more than three independent objects in the site, owned by different persons - Y.B., R.B. and LB, in view of which the norms of the Condominium Management Act are applicable. Upon inquiry at the TRRYULNC, it was found that a commercial company "B. Ltd. with managers L.B. and R.B., as there is no evidence that the company owns property at the address. It is not disputed that at the address, the city of S., a video surveillance system was built, consisting of five HIKVISION DS-2CD1331-I 3MP, 1/3" progressive scan CMOS, Up to 3.0 megapixel, 2.8 mm/4 mm /6 mm fixed focal lens, Up to 30 m IR range, Mobile monitoring via Hik-Connect or iVMS-4500 video cameras with the ability to record sound. and a staircase from the residential building (camera no. 5), as well as public places - part of a street and its adjacent sidewalks (cameras 1, 2 and 4). It was established that the entrance to the garage of R.B. The evidence on the case file and the statements of the parties, objectified in a completed questionnaire attached to the finding report of the CPLD inspection, testify that he had access to the personal data collected by means of the video surveillance system in the period from its installation in 2019 to 10.06.2021 L.B., considering that he has the capacity of a personal data administrator within the meaning of Art. 4, para. 7 of the GDPR. There is no evidence that the remaining defendants, passively legitimized parties in the proceedings, have anything to do with the surveillance carried out until 10.06.2021, respectively that they have access to the personal data collected through it, given that in relation to them - R.B., "B. " Ltd. and "S. " EOOD, the

complaint should be dismissed as unfounded regarding the video surveillance carried out until 10.06.2021. According to Appendix No. 2 to the security contract, dated 22.06.2021, concluded between "B. " Ltd. and "S. " EOOD, the last company registered under the Commercial Code, was entrusted with security with signal security systems for round-the-clock monitoring of a garage located at the address: town of S., using five cameras. Given the content of the contract dated 22.06.2021, as the administrator of personal data in relation to the video surveillance carried out on the basis of the contract, the assignor "B. Ltd., insofar as it is the latter that determines the purposes and means of processing personal data through the video surveillance system built at the address. "S. " EOOD should be treated as a processor of personal data insofar as it processes - accesses personal data collected through the video surveillance system, on behalf of the administrator against a fee and in fulfillment of the security contract, and the cameras are the property of the contracting party and are not installed and positioned by "S." Ltd. The fact that the contractor "B. " Ltd. not having access to the staff does not change this circumstance and its quality as a personal data administrator, insofar as "B. " Ltd. provided "S. " EOOD static IP address of the recording device (DVR), necessary to provide remote access to the National Duty Center of "S." /NODST to the records in the device, in case of violations in the protected object detected by the alarm system. The two companies, client and contractor, should not be treated as joint controllers insofar as the purposes and means of processing are determined by the client "B. Ltd., not jointly. Given the purpose of video surveillance, namely the protection of the administrator's property, the location and scope of camera 5 requires the conclusion that video surveillance was conducted in violation of the principles of Art. 5, § 1, letters "a" and "c" of the GDPR, of legality and data minimization, insofar as common parts of the EU fall within the scope of video surveillance. Evidence of a decision taken by the General Assembly of the condominium to implement the video surveillance has not been committed, the existence of such is not claimed, in view of which it should be assumed that there is no decision. Video surveillance is illegal, insofar as none of the other conditions mentioned in Art. 6, § 1 of the Regulation, as evidence to the contrary is not committed. There is a lack of evidence to substantiate the applicability of Art. 6, § 1, letter "b" of the GDPR - existence of a contract concluded between the parties for the execution of any necessary processing of personal data by means of the process camera or for taking steps at the request of the data subject before concluding the contract. Grounds under Art. 6, § 1, letters "d" and "e" of the GDPR are irrelevant - they are applicable in other, different and incompatible with the present hypotheses regarding the processing of personal data for the protection of vital interests, the performance of a task of public interest, as well as in the exercise of official powers, such as are not delegated to the controllers of personal data. It



cannot be assumed that there is also a preferential interest of L.B. and "B. " Ltd. for video surveillance carried out outside the property of Mr. B., as there is no evidence to the contrary, therefore it should be assumed that the interest of the natural persons, to whom the data refer, prevails over that of the person who placed the relevant camera, even more so because the presence of reasons - encroachments, committed crimes or conflicts or others that would justify the implementation of video surveillance of a common part of the condominium are not indicated. The arguments that the same is used to protect the property - apartment of L.B. above the entrance door on which the camera is placed, are untenable as long as it does not fall within the scope of observation. Considering the purpose of video surveillance carried out by cameras 1, 2 and 4 and its scope, the same is illegal, and also in violation of the principle of reducing data to a minimum - Art. 5, § 1, letters "a" and "c" of the GDPR. Contrary to the video surveillance carried out within the framework of one's own property (camera 3), it cannot be assumed that the video surveillance of public places represents a legitimate interest of the administrator given the lack of the latter's preferential interest over the interest of the natural persons subject to the surveillance - an unlimited and indefinite number of persons freely crossing the street. However, in the scope of video surveillance of cameras 1, 2 and 4, in addition to the approach to the defendant's garage, there are also public places, an adjacent street and sidewalks, the video surveillance of which is illegal, and also in violation of the principle of minimizing data given the purpose of video surveillance and the fact that the video surveillance is not limited to what is necessary in relation to the goals for its implementation - guarding the garage, according to the subject of the contract concluded between the parties, and the claims that expensive items are stored in the garage does not change this fact. Given the nature and type of the found violation and the fact that the same was suspended by L.B. and after 22.06.2021 the same does not carry out video surveillance, and also that the affected personal data are not sensitive in the sense of the law and there is no evidence of damage caused by the processing, the commission considers it expedient, proportional and effective to impose a corrective measure under Art. 58, § 2, letter "b" of Regulation EU 2016/679 of the administrator LB, finding that the same will achieve the purpose of the law. The remaining measures for under Art. 58, § 1, letter "a", "c", "e", "d", "f", "g", "h" and "j" of the GDPR are inapplicable and inexpedient due to the nature of the violation and the circumstance, that at the time of pronouncement the same was suspended by L.B. and the same does not have access to the video surveillance, and after 22.06.2021 he does not have the capacity of administrator of personal data. As far as the violation is the first for the administrator, the imposition of a fine for the detected violation would be excessive and in violation of the principle of proportionality under Art. 6 of the APC, according to which "when the administrative act affects

rights or creates obligations for citizens, those measures are applied that are more favorable to them, if in this way the goal of the law is achieved. " Regarding the found violation of "B. " Ltd. the circumstance that the same has not been suspended, and also that the affected personal data are not sensitive in the sense of the law and there is no evidence of damage caused by the processing, the commission considers it expedient, proportional and effective to impose a corrective measure under Art. 58, § 2, letter "d" of Regulation EU 2016/679 of the administrator, finding that the same will achieve the purpose of the law - it will stop the violation and restore the established legal order regarding the processing of personal data. The remaining measures for under Art. 58, § 1, letters "a", "b", "c", "e", "f", "g", "h" and "j" of the GDPR are inapplicable and inexpedient due to the nature of the violation and the circumstance, that at the time of pronouncement the same has not been suspended. As far as the violation is the first for the administrator, the imposition of a fine for the detected violation would be excessive and in violation of the principle of proportionality under Art. 6 of the APC, according to which "when the administrative act affects rights or creates obligations for citizens, those measures are applied that are more favorable to them, if in this way the goal of the law is achieved. However, it should be noted that the non-fulfillment of the commission's order, within the specified period, is accompanied by a sanction for non-fulfillment in view of its effectiveness and the possibility of an additional sanctioning mechanism for verification and control of the implementation. The goal is to achieve general prevention and proportionate and lawful processing of personal data. Thus, the orders are effective, as they are attached to the corresponding sanctions in case of non-fulfillment, and the legislator provides that in case of non-compliance with an effective order of the supervisory authority, an administrative penalty "fine" or "property penalty" will be imposed under Art. 83, paragraph 6 of Regulation 2016/679 in amounts up to EUR 20,000,000. Based on the above and based on Art. 38, para. 3 of the Personal Data Protection Act, the Personal Data Protection Commission DECIDES: 1. Accepts complaint PPN-02-343/21.08.2020 as well-founded in relation to L.B. regarding video surveillance carried out at the address in the city of S. from the summer of 2019 to 10.06.2021 by cameras 1, 2, 4 and 5. 2. On the basis of Art. 58, § 2, letter "b" of the GDPR issued an official warning to L.B. for the processing of personal data by means of video surveillance carried out at the address of the city of S. from the summer of 2019 to 10.06.2021 by cameras 1, 2, 4 and 5 in violation of Art. 5, § 1, letters "a" and "c" of the GDPR. 3. Accepted the complaint as well-founded in relation to "B. Ltd., administrator of personal data, regarding video surveillance carried out from 22.06.2021 at the address in the city of S. from cameras 1, 2, 4 and 5 in violation of Art. 5, § 1, letters "a" and "c" of the GDPR. 4. For violation of Art. 5, § 1, letters "a" and "c" of EU Regulation 2016/679 and on the basis of Art. 58, § 2, letter "d" of the

Regulation instructs the personal data administrator "B. " OOD to comply with the personal data processing operations with the provisions of the Regulation, by ceasing the surveillance of common parts of a building in condominium mode and public places - adjacent street, by dismantling camera No. 5, and repositioning cameras 1, 2 and 4 or redirect so that their scope includes secured property - a garage, without covering public places. The deadline for the implementation of the order - 14 days from the entry into force of the decision, after which to notify the commission of the implementation by presenting the relevant evidence.5. Accepted the complaint as groundless with regard to the video surveillance carried out by means of camera No. 3.

6. Accepts the appeal as groundless with regard to R.B. and "S." EOOD.

The decision is subject to appeal within 14 days of its delivery, through the Commission for the Protection of Personal Data before the Administrative Court of Sofia - city.

MEMBERS:

Tsanko Tsolov /p/

Maria Mateva /p/

Veselin Tselkov /p/

Download files

Decision on appeal with reg. No. PPN-02-343/21.08.2020

print