

DECISION № 837 Sofia, 12.02.2021 ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT - SOFIA-CITY, Second Department 23 panel, in a public session on 18.01.2021 in the following panel: JUDGE: Antoaneta Argirova with the participation of the Secretary Elia Mitova, considering case number 9546 on the inventory for 2020 reported by the judge, and to rule took into account the following: The proceedings are under Article 145 et seq. APC Administrative Procedure Code / APC /, supra Article 38, and Article 7 of the Personal Data Protection Act / PDPA /. Formed on Complaint entry №PPN-02-507 # 27 (19) /01.09.2020 on the list of the Commission for Personal Data Protection (CPDP), filed by the National Revenue Agency (NRA), against Decision №PPN -02-507 / 2019 of 18.08.2020 of the CPDP, in its part under item 2 and item 3, which accepted as well-founded Complaint with registration № PPN-02-507 of 19.09.2019 filed by D. V. F. J. B., for a violation by the NRA-administrator of personal data, of the provision of Art. 32, § 4 of the ORD and on the grounds of art. 58, § 2, letter "d" of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 (ORD) has instructed the Agency to introduce additional controls to establish unauthorized access and illegal processing of personal data, especially in the case of a task or project, which control should be systematic and prevent illegal actions. The stated grounds for contestation are for significant violations of the administrative-procedural rules, contradiction with the substantive legal norms and inconsistency with the purpose of the law - Article 146, item 3, item 4 and item 5 of the APC. Their implementation is substantiated by factual allegations and legal arguments for non-analysis by the CPDP of the entire body of evidence. It is alleged that the CPDP has not taken into account the arguments for the existence of a number of technical and organizational measures taken by the NRA to protect data, including from unauthorized access and other illegal forms of processing. It is pointed out that with regard to the NRA as a controller of personal data, there are legal grounds for processing personal data, according to Art. 6 of the ORD, as the Agency has taken all necessary technical and organizational measures for data protection, given the existence of a number of internal acts regulating approved internal rules for working with protected information and rules for access to IT resources of the Agency. These acts regulated specific obligations of the NRA employees, which are in accordance with the standards and good practices, in order to achieve security of the information processed in the NRA. Regarding the provision of proper control over the observance of the introduced special requirements and rules for access and work with protected information, it is stated that in case of ascertainment of abuses and / or unregulated access to personal data actions are taken for realization of responsibility according to the current legislation, In addition, the Agency has appointed employees - data protection officers, who carry out internal inspections in case of reports of violations by NRA employees, as a result of which is

sanctioned any established manifestation of unscrupulous and / or illegal processing of information protected by law. It is alleged that the established illegal processing of personal data by an official of the NRA is a result of non-compliance with the orders of the ORD, the Personal Data Protection Act and the internal rules and instructions of the NRA, therefore the responsibility lies entirely with the individual NAP. The established illegal behavior on the part of the employee should not be a reason to consider that the NRA does not have measures to protect the information during its processing. before the ACCG the applicant was represented by a jurk. T., who upheld the complaint and asked for its respect. She stated that the access to B.'s data was the result of the actions of an employee of the National Revenue Agency, which were carried out despite the measures taken by the agency. He objects to the excessiveness of the lawyer's remuneration paid by the interested party (LA). The defendant - CPDP, in o.s.z. does not appear and is not represented. In Written Notes dated 15.01.2021. sets out detailed considerations for the unfoundedness of the filed complaint and asks for its rejection. ZS D. V. F. J.B. In o.s.z. through his procedural representative E. argues that the complaint is unfounded, stating that the internal organizational acts are not able to prevent the actual implementation of illegal processing, as they do not provide a technical obstacle for employees with the appropriate level of access to perform data processing outside their tasks. In addition, it states that the detection of unlawful processing is not done automatically by the data controller, and the breach may only be detected after referral by the person concerned. He set out detailed considerations in the written response to the complaint submitted in the case. Declares a request for awarding the costs of the court proceedings, in accordance with the list under Article 80 of the CPC, in conjunction with Article 144 of the APC. A prosecutor from the Sofia City Prosecutor's Office did not take part in the proceedings in the case and did not give a conclusion on the legality of the challenged act. Administrative Court - Sofia city, after discussing the grounds relevant to the appeal, the arguments of the parties in court, assessed the evidence gathered in the case under Article 235 of the CPC, supra Article 144 of the APC and ex officio, pursuant to Article 168 , para 1, supra art. 146 of the APC, fully checked the legality of the appealed act, finds the following: The proceedings before the Commission were instituted on a received Signal with reg. V. F. J. B., a Dutch citizen with the status of a permanent resident of the Republic of Bulgaria, informing that he has lived and worked in Bulgaria for more than five years, is registered for tax purposes and pays taxes regularly, has participations in commercial companies and is a member of the board of directors of a large holding company. He pointed out that a divorce case has been filed №66853/2018. according to the inventory of the Sofia District Court, having filed a request for termination of marriage with his wife F.H., due to factual separation. From a conversation with his wife B. he

learned that V.M.N. had offered H. to provide her with information and documents concerning B. from the NRA database, ensuring that the information was authentic because his wife - GN and his mother. N. work in the Central Office of the National Revenue Agency S.-grad and have the opportunity to access accounts and download data without hindrance. In view of the above, the sender of the signal asks for an inspection to establish whether the NRA files have made unregulated inquiries and extracts from his personal accounts and from the accounts of the companies in which he participates. With Letter ex. № PPN-02-507 # 2 / 14.11.2019 on the list of the CPDP, B. was informed that an administrative proceeding was initiated on the filed complaint, and additional evidence was requested from the administrator against whom the complaint was filed. With Letter ex. № PPN-02-570 # 1 / 14.11.2019 according to the inventory of the CPDP, the NRA was given a deadline for expressing an opinion and presenting relevant evidence. In response, an Opinion was received with ent. № PPN-01-337 # 4 / 05.12.2019, which states that on 16.09.2019. a complaint was filed, entered in the registry of the Central Office of the National Revenue Agency with ent. № 94-D-434 / 16.09.2019, with identical statements. In this regard, by order of the Executive Director of the NRA, the Inspectorate was instructed to conduct an inspection, which established that the applicant's data in the information system (IS) of the NRA were accessed by B. Y. N. - Chief Expert on Revenues (D.) in the Special Investigations Investigation Department of the Control Directorate at the Central Office of the National Revenue Agency, without in these cases the employee being assigned tasks related to the person. In view of the findings of the employee, written explanations were required. The answers provided stated that N. had accessed the person's data for the purpose of "personal information" and in connection with "review of data on registered companies". With an electronic message dated November 1, 2019, signed in an electronic signature, N. stated that she did not make printouts and did not provide the data to third parties. The opinion also stated that no data had been collected on access to the complainant's data in the NRA's information systems by expert GN in the Outgoing Communications Department, Information Center Directorate at the NRA's Central Office. The statement also sent a Report on the access to data of B. by G. B. N. in "Software and Revenue Management", a Report on the access to data of B. by G. B. N. in OJSC, Reference on the accesses made to B. by G. B. N. in IS "Control", Information on the accesses made to B. by G. B. N. in "Management Information System", Excerpt from the written explanations of 18.10 .2019 of BI, related to the data referred to in the letter of the CPDP. Written explanations from BN from 21.10.2019, 01.11.2019. and job description of G. B. I. /p.22-p.29 in the case /. At a meeting held on 22.01.2020 the CPDP accepted the filed complaint as admissible, in the part related to the NRA and was scheduled for consideration in open session on 04.03.2020. JB and

respondent National Revenue Agency. With Letters ex. № PPN-02-507 (19) # 7 / 28.01.2020. and ex. № PPN-02-507 (19) # 8 / 28.01.2020, the parties in the proceedings before the CPDP have been notified that the Complaint Reg. №PPN-02-507 / 19.09.2019. will be considered on the merits at an open meeting, which will be held on 04.03.2020 from 13:00. (p.40- p.42 in the case). On 02.03.2020 The CPDP's office has received an Opinion Reg. № PPN-02-507 # 16 (19) from the National Revenue Agency. At the meeting held on 04.03.2020 from 13:00. open meeting, the commission has decided to postpone the consideration of the Complaint reg.№PPN-02-507 / 19.09.2019. on being in open session on 01.04.2020 from 13:00. The parties in the proceedings before the CPDP have been notified by Letters ref. № PPN-02-507 (19) # 13 / 09.03.2020. and ex. № PPN-02-507 (19) # 4 / 09.03.2020. (p.47- p.49 in the case). In view of the epidemiological situation, the meeting was rescheduled for 19.05.20, of which the parties were notified. On 19.05.2020 the hearing was held, at which the proceedings ended and the contested Decision №PPN-02-507 / 2019 of 18.08.2020 was ruled. Based on the data in the file, with the contested decision before the court the CPDP accepted as established that within three months - from 20.02.2019 to 10.05.2019 access was provided by employees of the NRA through the information system of the NRA to the data of the complainant, without in this case the employees were set tasks related to B .. With regard to the natural person BN, it has been established that the latter received the data of B. on 20 February 2019, 3 April 2019, 10 May 2019. From the Decree of 39 18391 provided as evidence / 2019 On 10 February 2019 the Sofia City Prosecutor's Office found that the employee GN also had access to the applicant's data without a legal basis. The Commission accepted as indisputably established that the personal data controller, after establishing that there is a violation has taken action through an internal inspection of the signal. Disciplinary proceedings have been instituted against the two employees, with employee GN being given a disciplinary sanction of "postponing the promotion to one year", and employee BN being scheduled to schedule a disciplinary case for her hearing. that in its decision the CPDP justified the conclusion that the personal data of D. V. F. J.B. had been illegally processed, For these reasons, the CPDP considered that the personal data controller had not taken the necessary technical and organizational measures to protect the complainant's personal data from unauthorized access or that the measures taken were clearly insufficient, given the fact that the in the registers of the NRA the personal data of the complainant were accessed without proven official necessity by employees of the NRA, in violation of the order the date of art. 32, §4 of the ORD. It is also accepted that the most appropriate corrective measure under Art. 58, § 2 of the Regulation is the imposition of a coercive administrative measure, as this will achieve the intended effect of ending such violations in the future. The Commission has

substantiated the conclusion that risk methodology should include controls on unauthorized access to show if an employee repeatedly accesses personal data without the appropriate authorization and task from his / her immediate supervisor, in such cases the direct supervisor or to submit to the internal control information that the respective employee does not lawfully process information that is personal data. Controls should be systematic and prevent illegal actions. For these reasons, the CPDP has accepted the complaint as well-founded and on the grounds of Art. 58, § 2, letter "d" of EU Regulation 2016/6779 with the contested decision before the court, in the part under items 2 and 3 has ordered the NRA to introduce additional controls for unauthorized access and illegal processing of personal data, The decision was signed with a special opinion by a member of the CPDP - CC. The special opinion is motivated by the fact that there is no proven leakage of data from the NRA D. V. F. J. B., no evidence was adduced in support of B.'s claim that his personal data had become known to a third party, and an internal inspection by the NRA found that B.'s personal data had been obtained by having rights for this type of operation, but not specifically working on the documents of B., there is no evidence that the data were disseminated, and that the violation is administrative The decision was communicated to the applicant in the present proceedings by Letter No. PPN-02-507 (19) / # 25 of 18.0 8.2020 (p. 66 in the case) on 18.08.2020, evident from a printout of the system for electronic exchange of documents (p. 67 in the case). The complaint was submitted through the CPDP to the ACCG on 01.09.2020. Given the factual findings, the court determined the following legal conclusions: The appeal is admissible. It was filed against an act that can be challenged in court and by a competent party - Article 147, paragraph 1 of the APC, supra Article 38, paragraph 6 of LPPD. The preclusive 14-day term under Article 149, paragraph 1 of the APC has also been observed. Considered on the merits, the complaint is unfounded, for the following reasons: The disputed administrative act was issued by a competent authority - CPDP. The Commission met in a legal composition and the decision was taken by the required majority. The CPDP is a collegial administrative body, which consists of a chairman and four members, according to art. 7 ZZLD. According to Art. 9, para 3 LPPD, the decisions of the commission shall be taken by a majority of the total number of its members. The provision of art. 8, para 6 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPDP and its administration stipulates that the meetings of the commission shall be held if at least three of its members are present. In this case, as evidenced by Minutes №19 / 19.05.2020, the meeting was attended by 4 members. A member of the panel signed the decision with a dissenting opinion on the merits of the complaint filed with the CPDP and set out his reasons for this. The dissenting opinion together with the reasons of the majority is attached to the decision, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the

Commission for Personal Data Protection and its administration. The established written form has been observed as the disputed decision contains the ones required by Art. 59, para. 2 APC details, insofar as the applicable special law - LPPD does not contain special requirements for the form and content of the act. The existence of a defect in the form of the act, representing an independent ground for its revocation within the meaning of Art. 146, item 2, supra art. 59, para. 2, item 4 of the APC. On the allegation of significant violations of the administrative-procedural rules, a prerequisite for revocation of the decision on the grounds of Art. 168, para. 1 in connection with Art. 146, item 3 of the APC, the court took into account the following: The proceedings were instituted lawfully in accordance with the provision of Art. 38, para. 1 of LPPD, in connection with Art. 28, para. 1, item 1, art. 29, para. 1, art. 30, para. 1 and Art. 36 et seq. Of the Regulations. With a decision from a meeting, objectified in Minutes № 3 / 22.01.2020. / I. 71-74 /, the appeal is declared admissible / art. 27 of the APC /, the parties in the proceedings have been constituted and the examination of the dispute on the merits is envisaged / Art. 38, para. 3 PDKZLDNA /. The legislator has not introduced specific requirements to be met by the person submitting the complaint, on the contrary - in Art. 38, para. 1 of the LPPD the expression "any natural person" is used. The provision of art. 40 of the PDKZLDNA, according to which the CPDP collects evidence, appoints experts and calls, as well as performs other actions in the proceedings under Section II "Consideration of complaints by individuals" under the APC. In the course of the previous administrative proceedings, no violations of the procedural rules of the category of the essential ones were committed, which would have limited the right of defense of the appellant and prevented him from exercising it in full. The administrative body clarified the facts and circumstances relevant to the case and verified the accepted evidence. No violations were found under Art. 34, art. 35 and art. 36 of the APC. The parties to the proceedings were given the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the evidence attached to the file and to express an opinion. In ruling on the merits of the dispute, the written evidence gathered in the file was discussed, as well as the opinions expressed on the allegations made in the complaint. The right of defense of the complainant, regularly notified of the open hearing before the CPDP is not limited, as his participation in the administrative proceedings is guaranteed, and the latter was conducted in accordance with the special provisions of the CPDP and the principles of the process - truth, equality, accessibility, publicity and transparency / art. 7, Art. 8 and Art. 12 of the APC /. The transcripts-extracts of minutes from meetings of the CPDP on 22.01.2020, 04-06.02.2020 and 19.05.2020 attached to the case. comply with the provision of Art. 11, para. 2 of the Regulations. Decision № PPN-02-507 / 2019 of 18.08.2020, taken by the required majority and signed by the persons participating in the voting on 19.05.2020, was not issued in case of significant

violations of the administrative-procedural rules. The objection for a procedural violation, motivated by the allegation that the Commission did not take into account the arguments for the existence of a number of technical and organizational measures taken by the NRA for data protection is unfounded. It is evident from the decision of the CPDP that it has gathered all the necessary evidence and has objectively investigated all the facts, for which it has set out the relevant reasons. The contested decision was rendered in accordance with the applicable substantive provisions, and the applicant's arguments to the contrary are unfounded. The applicable substantive law is the one in force as of the date of the violation - 20.02.2019. until the moment of its termination, i.e. the provisions of EU Regulation 2016/679 are applicable. Definition of the term "personal data" at the time of their processing is given in Art. 4, § 1, item 1 of EU Regulation 2016/679. According to Article 4, §2 of EU Regulation 2016/679 "processing of personal data" is any operation or set of operations performed with personal data or a set of personal data by automatic or other means such as collecting, recording, organizing, structuring, storing, adapting or modifying, retrieving, consulting, using, disclosing, transmitting, distributing or otherwise making data available, arranging or combining, restricting, deleting or destroying. The data contained in the NRA database are personal data within the meaning of Art. 4, § 1, item 1 of Regulation / EU / 2016/679, as information relating to a natural person that enables him to be identified with these specific features. The access to the NRA database is an action for "processing of personal data" within the meaning of Art. 4, item 2 of the Regulation. In the procedural case it was indisputably established that the personal data of the Insurance Act D. V. F. F. J. B. were processed - accessible, by employees of the NRA, in his capacity of "controller of personal data" within the meaning of Art. 4, § 7 of EU Regulation 2016/679. In order for such processing to be lawful, there must be at least one of the grounds for admissibility of processing. The conditions for admissibility in the processing of personal data are explicitly and exhaustively specified in Art. 6, § 1 of EU Regulation 2016/679, / applicable on the date of the infringement /. According to that provision, processing is lawful only if and to the extent that at least one of the following conditions is applicable: (a) the data subject has consented to the processing of his or her personal data for one or more specific purposes; (b) the processing is necessary for the performance of a contract to which the data subject is a party or for taking steps at the request of the data subject prior to the conclusion of the contract; (c) the processing is necessary to comply with a legal obligation to which the controller is subject; (d) the processing is necessary in order to protect the vital interests of the data subject or another natural person; (e) the processing is necessary for the performance of a task in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority conferred on the administrator; (f) the processing is necessary for the legitimate interests of the controller or a third party,

except where such interests take precedence over the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require the protection of personal data, in particular where the data subject is kid. Point (f) of the first subparagraph shall not apply to processing carried out by public authorities in the performance of their tasks. In the administrative proceedings, as well as in the court proceedings, it is not disputed that the processing of personal data of the Insurance Act was carried out without the NRA employees having set tasks related to the person. The allegation of the complainant that with regard to the NRA, as a controller of personal data, there are grounds under Art. 6, §1 of Regulation 2016/679 on the processing of personal data of the Insurance Act D. V. F. F. J. the personal data of the Insurance Act have been accessed many times by the employees GN and BN in connection with the implementation of a task that is carried out in the public interest. On the contrary, the controller of personal data admits that his employee has processed the personal data of the CA without having set a task, without any grounds for such processing and without a legitimate legal interest in the processing, ie. there was no need to process B.'s data, nor did he give his consent. In view of the above, the only possible conclusion is that the case is illegal processing by employees of the NRA of the personal data of D. F. J. B. In Art. 32, § 4 of the Regulation stipulates the obligation for the controller and the processor to take steps for any natural person acting under the direction of the controller or the processor who has access to personal data to process such data only on the instructions of the controller, unless the person concerned is required to do so under Union law or the law of a Member State. In the specific case, it is not disputed in the case that within three months - from 20.02.2019 to 10.05.2019 was accessed by an employee of the NRA (BN), through the information system of the NRA, to the data of the Insurance Act, without in the specific case the employee has been assigned tasks related to him. It is not disputed in the administrative file that the administrator, after establishing that there was a violation, took action through an internal inspection on a submitted signal. Disciplinary proceedings were instituted against the two employees, with the disciplinary sanction "postponement of the promotion to one year" imposed on the employee GN, and the disciplinary proceedings against the employee BN had not been completed at the time of the ruling. It was established that the employees had the competence to perform this type of inspections, but they were not assigned such a task during this period. of personal data, because there is no mechanism established by the NRA itself. has taken the necessary technical and organizational measures to protect the complainant's personal data from unauthorized access or and clearly insufficient, given the fact that the personal data of the complainant contained in the registers of the NRA are available in the absence of legal necessity by the NRA employees themselves (and in fact in unexamined and unidentified in administrative proceedings



motives and goals is a volitional action, i.e. is aimed at achieving a specific goal). In this sense, the complainant's objection that the Agency has taken all necessary technical and organizational measures to protect personal data, given the existence of a number of internal acts regulating established internal rules for working with protected information and rules for access to IT resources of the NRA, unreasonable. The complaint does not indicate any technical measure that is able to actually prevent the illegal processing of personal data by NRA employees or to promptly signal the implementation of illegal processing.

Access to personal data is not limited to a specific task and only to what is necessary for the performance of official duties. On the contrary, the data are constantly available to each NRA employee with the appropriate level of access. For this reason, NRA employees have accessed the personal data of ZS B. in this case repeatedly and for months, without being tasked with processing this personal data. Secondly, the signing of declarations by NRA employees in no way creates real guarantees against the illegal processing of personal data of data subjects. These declarations may be relevant to the exercise of the disciplinary liability of employees in the event of their misconduct in the course of or in connection with the performance of their official duties, but this liability is subsequent to the breach. It is not able to prevent it, so it cannot be considered an effective measure to protect personal data. Regarding the provision of proper control of the introduced special requirements and rules for access and work with protected information, the case did not prove that there are mechanisms for establishing the illegal processing of personal data by NRA employees when there is no signal from the affected person. , whose data have been processed improperly, as the court has already pointed out. Once the administrator's staff can process the data without having a task related to it, after they can do so at any time and after there is no mechanism for the illegal processing to be automatically or ex officio detected (which ultimately facilitates the illegal processing), the NRA has not fulfilled its obligation under Art. 32, item 1 ORZD. The lack of real effective control has allowed the illegal processing of personal data of D. V. F. J. B. repeatedly for months, without this behavior being established by the controller of personal data, much less sanctioned. In this sense, the adopted interdepartmental acts obviously do not represent a sufficient guarantee for lawful processing of personal data by the NRA employees themselves. The content of the complaint to the ACCG shows that the NRA took control measures only after it was referred to it by the affected person and after the violation had already been committed, and repeatedly over time. However, not every affected person can be expected to be aware of how and through which particular controller his personal data have been improperly processed, will become or have become available to a third party in order to be able to exercise his right to protection against the respective administrator. Only the coincidence of circumstances allowed

the Insurance Agency to find out about the illegal processing of his data in this case by NRA employees. In view of the above, the administrative body has correctly qualified the offense as a violation of Art. 32, § 4 of Regulation 2016/679 failure to take steps, any natural person acting under the direction of the controller or processor who has access to personal data to process such data only on the instructions of the controller, unless the person in question is not required to do so under Union law or the law of a Member State. of the natural person who accessed the data illegally. The Regulation explicitly provides for the obligations of

administrators or processors of personal data, such as non-compliance the latter correspond to the same.

The CPDP has operational independence, as in accordance with the functions assigned to it shall assess which of the corrective powers under Art.

58, § 2 of the Regulation to exercise. The assessment should be based on considerations of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the decision in taking into account the specifics of each case and the degree of involvement of

the interests of the individual natural person - data subject, as well as the public interest. The powers under Art. 58, § 2 of the Regulation, without

b. "And" are in the nature of coercive administrative measures aimed at to prevent, resp. to suspend the infringement, such as

in this way the target behavior in the field of protection of personal data. The administrative penalty "fine" or "property"

sanction ", provided in b. "And" of Art. 58, § 2 of the regulation has a sanction nature and shall be applied in addition to the measures under b. "A" - "h" and "y" or instead, ie it is entirely up to the supervisory authority to decide whether or not

apply to the specific case any of those listed in b. "A" - "z" and "y" coercive administrative measures or impose a fine or property

sanction or to apply any of the measures under b. "A" - "h" and "y" together with the imposition of an administrative penalty under b. "And". In determining

the corrective action should be in line with the objective pursued by its imposition and whether this goal will be achieved by its implementation. IN the specific case the CPDP has chosen to issue only PAM, without imposing administrative penalty of the NRA as a controller of personal data. This one its assessment and beyond the scope of the due judicial control - Article 169 of the APC, a and the court may not seize and exercise for the first time a power which The CPDP did not exercise the contested decision.

In view of the foregoing, the court considers that the challenged decision is lawful administrative act on all examined grounds under Article 146 of the APC, therefore, the unfounded appeal is rejected.

Given the outcome of the dispute and on the grounds of Article 143, paragraph 4 of the APC, the defendant is entitled to costs but cannot be awarded for lack of costs request for this (art. 143, para 4 and art. 81 CPC, supra art. 144 APC).

The right to expenses is also granted to the Insurance Act D. V. F. J. B. - Article 143, paragraph 3 of the APC, which is duly exercised, as in o.s.z. on 18.01.2020. the court requested their award.

The proven costs amount to BGN 500 - remuneration paid for defense, carried out by one lawyer (art. 78, para 1 CPC, supra art. 144 APC). At compliance with art. 78, para 5 CPC, supra art. 144 APC and art. 8, para. 3 of Ordinance № 1 of 9 July 2004 on the minimum amounts of attorneys' fees, the applicant's relevant objection of overpayment from the Insurance Act attorney's fees are unfounded.

Thus motivated, Administrative Court Sofia-city, II-ro ward, 23rd panel:

R

E

Sh

And:

DISMISSES Complaint Reg. Index №PPN-02-507 # 27 (19) /01.09.2020 of

CPDP filed by the National Revenue Agency against Decision №

PPN-02-507 / 2019 of 18.08.2020 of the Commission for Personal Data Protection,

as unfounded.

SENTENCES the National Revenue Agency, represented by G.

E. - executive director to pay to D. V. F. J. B., LNC [PIN] the amount c

amount of BGN 500.00 / five hundred /, costs for the first instance court

production.

The decision can be appealed in cassation before

The Supreme Administrative Court within 14 days of its announcement.

The decision to be communicated to the parties by sending copies

of it by the order of art. 137 APC.

JUDGE: