Processing personal data by operator of search engine in search results

- Therefore, it must be found that, in exploring the internet automatically, constantly and systematically in search of the information which is published there, the operator of a search engine ‘collects’ such data which it subsequently ‘retrieves’, ‘records’ and ‘organises’ within the framework of its indexing programmes, ‘stores’ on its servers and, as the case may be, ‘discloses’ and ‘makes available’ to its users in the form of lists of search results. As those operations are referred to expressly and unconditionally in Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46, they must be classified as ‘processing’ within the meaning of that provision, regardless of the fact that the operator of the search engine also carries out the same operations in respect of other types of information and does not distinguish between the latter and the personal data. Nor is the foregoing finding affected by the fact that those data have already been published on the internet and are not altered by the search engine.

The operator of this search engine is responsible for the processing: he determines the purposes and means of that activity.

- It is the search engine operator which determines the purposes and means of that activity and thus of the processing of personal data that it itself carries out within the framework of that activity and which must, consequently, be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of that processing pursuant to Article 2(d).

38 Inasmuch as the activity of a search engine is therefore liable to affect significantly, and additionally compared with that of the publishers of websites, the fundamental rights to privacy and to the protection of personal data, the operator of the search engine as the person determining the purposes and means of that activity must ensure, within the framework of its responsibilities, powers and capabilities, that the activity meets the requirements of Directive 95/46 in order that the guarantees laid down by the directive may have full effect and that effective and complete protection of data subjects, in particular of their right to privacy, may actually be achieved.

Processing of the personal data of a search engine is carried out in the context of activities of the establishment on the territory of the Member State, when the establishment was founded for the purpose of promotion and sale of advertising space offered by the search engine

- In the light of that objective of Directive 95/46 and of the wording of Article 4(1)(a), it must be held that the processing of personal data for the purposes of the service of a search engine such as Google Search, which is operated by an undertaking that has its seat in a third State but has an establishment in a Member State, is carried out ‘in the context of the activities’ of that establishment if the latter is intended to promote and sell, in that Member State, advertising space offered by the search engine which serves to make the service offered by that engine profitable.

56 In such circumstances, the activities of the operator of the search engine and those of its establishment situated in the Member State concerned are inextricably linked since the activities relating to the advertising space constitute the means of rendering the search engine at issue economically profitable and that engine is, at the same time, the means enabling those activities to be performed.

The operator of a search engine is under certain conditions obliged to remove links to webpages published by third parties, even if the publication on those the webpages is lawful.

- That Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, in order to comply with the rights laid down in those provisions and in so far as the conditions laid down by those provisions are in fact satisfied, the operator of a search engine is obliged to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name links to web pages, published by third parties and containing information relating to that person, also in a case where that name or information is not erased beforehand or simultaneously from those web pages, and even, as the case may be, when its publication in itself on those pages is lawful.

87 Indeed, since the inclusion in the list of results, displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name, of a web page and of the information contained on it relating to that person makes access to that information appreciably easier for any internet user making a search in respect of the person concerned and may play a decisive role in the dissemination of that information, it is liable to constitute a more significant interference with the data subject’s fundamental right to privacy than the publication on the web page.

Right to be forgotten, when processing by the search engine is currently incompatible with the Directive, unless special reasons resist against this
- Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46/EC are to be interpreted as meaning that, when appraising the conditions for the application of those provisions, it should inter alia be examined whether the data subject has a right that the information in question relating to him personally should, at this point in time, no longer be linked to his name by a list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name, without it being necessary in order to find such a right that the inclusion of the information in question in that list causes prejudice to the data subject. As the data subject may, in the light of his fundamental rights under Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter, request that the information in question no longer be made available to the general public on account of its inclusion in such a list of results, those rights override, as a rule, not only the economic interest of the operator of the search engine but also the interest of the general public in having access to that information upon a search relating to the data subject’s name. However, that would not be the case if it appeared, for particular reasons, such as the role played by the data subject in public life, that the interference with his fundamental rights is justified by the preponderant interest of the general public in having, on account of its inclusion in the list of results, access to the information in question.

Source: curia.europa.eu
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In Case C-131/12,
REQUEST for a preliminary ruling under Article 267 TFEU from the Audiencia Nacional (Spain), made by decision of 27 February 2012, received at the Court on 9 March 2012, in the proceedings
Google Spain SL,
Google Inc.
v
Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (AEPD),
Mario Costeja González,
THE COURT (Grand Chamber), composed of V. Skouris, President, K. Lenaerts, Vice-President, M. Ilešič (Rapporteur), L. Bay Larsen, T. von Danwitz, M. Sařijan, Presidents of Chambers, J. Malenovský, E. Levits, A. Ó Caoimh, A. Arabadjiev, M. Berger, A. Prechal and E. Jarašiūnas Judges, Advocate General: N. Jääskinen, Registrar: M. Ferreira, Principal Administrator, having regard to the written procedure and further to the hearing on 26 February 2013, after considering the observations submitted on behalf of:
– Google Spain SL and Google Inc., by F. González Díaz, J. Baño Fos and B. Holles, abogados,
– Mr Costeja González, by J. Muñoz Rodriguez, abogado,
– the Spanish Government, by A. Rubio González, acting as Agent,
– the Greek Government, by E.-M. Mamouna and K. Boskovits, acting as Agents,
– the Italian Government, by G. Palmieri, acting as Agent, and P. Gentili, avvocato dello Stato,
– the Austrian Government, by G. Kunert and C. Pesendorfer, acting as Agents,
– the Polish Government, by B. Majczyna and M. Szpunar, acting as Agents,
– the European Commission, by I. Martínez del Peral and B. Martenczuk, acting as Agents,
after hearing the Opinion of the Advocate General at the sitting on 25 June 2013,
gives the following
Judgment
1. This request for a preliminary ruling concerns the interpretation of Article 2(b) and (d), Article 4(1)(a) and (c), Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (OJ 1995 L 281, p. 31) and of Article 8 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (‘the Charter’).
2. The request has been made in proceedings between, on the one hand, Google Spain SL (‘Google Spain’) and Google Inc. and, on the other, the Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (Spanish Data Protection Agency; ‘the AEPD’) and Mr Costeja González concerning a decision by the AEPD upholding the complaint lodged by Mr Costeja González against those two companies and ordering Google Inc. to adopt the measures necessary to withdraw personal data relating to Mr Costeja González from its index and to prevent access to the data in the future.
Legal context
European Union law
3. Directive 95/46 which, according to Article 1, has the object of protecting the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons, and in particular their right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data, and of removing obstacles to the free
flow of such data, states in recitals 2, 10, 18 to 20 and 25 in its preamble: 

''(2) ...data-processing systems are designed to serve man; ...they must, whatever the nationality or residence of natural persons, respect their fundamental rights and freedoms, notably the right to privacy, and contribute to ...the well-being of individuals;

... (10) ...the object of the national laws on the processing of personal data is to protect fundamental rights and freedoms, notably the right to privacy, which is recognised both in Article 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms [ ... signed in Rome on 4 November 1950] and in the general principles of Community law; ... for that reason, the approximation of those laws must not result in any lessening of the protection they afford but must, on the contrary, seek to ensure a high level of protection in the Community;

... (18) ... in order to ensure that individuals are not deprived of the protection to which they are entitled under this Directive, any processing of personal data in the Community must be carried out in accordance with the law of one of the Member States; ... in this connection, processing carried out under the responsibility of a controller who is established in a Member State should be governed by the law of that State;

(19) ... establishment on the territory of a Member State implies the effective and real exercise of activity through stable arrangements; ... the legal form of such an establishment, whether simply [a] branch or a subsidiary with a legal personality, is not the determining factor in this respect; ... when a single controller is established on the territory of several Member States, particularly by means of subsidiaries, he must ensure, in order to avoid any circumvention of national rules, that each of the establishments fulfils the obligations imposed by the national law applicable to its activities;

(20) ... the fact that the processing of data is carried out by a person established in a third country must not stand in the way of the protection of individuals provided for in this Directive; ... in these cases, the processing should be governed by the law of the Member State in which the means used are located, and there should be guarantees to ensure that the rights and obligations provided for in this Directive are respected in practice;

... (25) ... the principles of protection must be reflected, on the one hand, in the obligations imposed on persons ... responsible for processing, in particular regarding data quality, technical security, notification to the supervisory authority, and the circumstances under which processing can be carried out, and, on the other hand, in the right conferred on individuals, the data on whom are the subject of processing, to be informed that processing is taking place, to consult the data, to request corrections and even to object to processing in certain circumstances'.

4. Article 2 of Directive 95/46 states that '[f]or the purposes of this Directive:

(a) “personal data” shall mean any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person (“data subject”); an identifiable person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identification number or to one or more factors specific to his physical, physiological, mental, economic, cultural or social identity;

(b) “processing of personal data” (“processing”) shall mean any operation or set of operations which is performed upon personal data, whether or not by automatic means, such as collection, recording, organisation, storage, adaptation or alteration, retrieval, consultation, use, disclosure by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available, alignment or combination, blocking, erasure or destruction;

... (d) “controller” shall mean the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or any other body which alone or jointly with others determines the purposes and means of the processing of personal data, where the purposes and means of processing are determined by national or Community laws or regulations, the controller or the specific criteria for his nomination may be designated by national or Community law;

... 5. Article 3 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘Scope’, states in paragraph 1:

'This Directive shall apply to the processing of personal data wholly or partly by automatic means, and to the processing otherwise than by automatic means of personal data which form part of a filing system or are intended to form part of a filing system.’

6. Article 4 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘National law applicable’, provides:

‘1. Each Member State shall apply the national provisions it adopts pursuant to this Directive to the processing of personal data where:
(a) the processing is carried out in the context of the activities of an establishment of the controller on the territory of the Member State; when the same controller is established on the territory of several Member States, he must take the necessary measures to ensure that each of these establishments complies with the obligations laid down by the national law applicable;
(b) the controller is not established on the Member State’s territory, but in a place where its national law applies by virtue of international public law;
(c) the controller is not established on Community territory and, for purposes of processing personal data makes use of equipment, automated or otherwise, situated on the territory of the said Member State, unless such equipment is used only for purposes of transit through the territory of the Community.'
2. In the circumstances referred to in paragraph 1(c), the controller must designate a representative established in the territory of that Member State, without prejudice to legal actions which could be initiated against the controller himself.’

7. In Section I (entitled ‘Principles relating to data quality’) of Chapter II of Directive 95/46, Article 6 is worded as follows: ‘1. Member States shall provide that personal data must be:
   (a) processed fairly and lawfully;
   (b) collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes. Further processing of data for historical, statistical or scientific purposes shall not be considered as incompatible provided that Member States provide appropriate safeguards;
   (c) adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purposes for which they are collected and/or further processed;
   (d) accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date; every reasonable step must be taken to ensure that data which are inaccurate or incomplete, having regard to the purposes for which they were collected or for which they are further processed, are erased or rectified;
   (e) kept in a form which permits identification of data subjects for no longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the data were collected or for which they are further processed. Member States shall lay down appropriate safeguards for personal data stored for longer periods for historical, statistical or scientific use.
2. It shall be for the controller to ensure that paragraph 1 is complied with.’

8. In Section II (entitled ‘Criteria for making data processing legitimate’) of Chapter II of Directive 95/46, Article 7 provides: ‘Member States shall provide that personal data may be processed only if:
   ...
   (f) processing is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by the third party or parties to whom the data are disclosed, except where such interests are overridden by the interests [or] fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject which require protection under Article 1(1).’

9. Article 9 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘Processing of personal data and freedom of expression’, provides: ‘Member States shall provide for exemptions or derogations from the provisions of this Chapter, Chapter IV and Chapter VI for the processing of personal data carried out solely for journalistic purposes or the purpose of artistic or literary expression only if they are necessary to reconcile the right to privacy with the rules governing freedom of expression.’

10. Article 12 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘Rights of access’, provides: ‘Member States shall guarantee every data subject the right to obtain from the controller:
   (b) as appropriate the rectification, erasure or blocking of data the processing of which does not comply with the provisions of this Directive, in particular because of the incomplete or inaccurate nature of the data;
   ...’

11. Article 14 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘The data subject’s right to object’, provides: ‘Member States shall grant the data subject the right: (a) at least in the cases referred to in Article 7(e) and (f), to object at any time on compelling legitimate grounds relating to his particular situation to the processing of data relating to him, save where otherwise provided by national legislation. Where there is a justified objection, the processing instigated by the controller may no longer involve those data; ...’

12. Article 28 of Directive 95/46, entitled ‘Supervisory authority’, is worded as follows: ‘1. Each Member State shall provide that one or more public authorities are responsible for monitoring the application within its territory of the provisions adopted by the Member States pursuant to this Directive.

3. Each authority shall in particular be endowed with: – investigative powers, such as powers of access to data forming the subject-matter of processing operations and powers to collect all the information necessary for the performance of its supervisory duties, – effective powers of intervention, such as, for example, that ... of ordering the blocking, erasure or destruction of data, of imposing a temporary or definitive ban on processing ...
   – ...

Decisions by the supervisory authority which give rise to complaints may be appealed against through the courts.

4. Each supervisory authority shall hear claims lodged by any person, or by an association representing that person, concerning the protection of his rights and freedoms in regard to the processing of personal data. The person concerned shall be informed of the outcome of the claim.

6. Each supervisory authority is competent, whatever the national law applicable to the processing in question, to exercise, on the territory of its own Member State, the powers conferred on it in accordance with paragraph 3. Each authority may be requested to exercise its powers by an authority of another Member State. The supervisory authorities shall cooperate with one another to the extent necessary for the performance of their duties, in particular by exchanging all useful information.

Spanish law

13. Directive 95/46 was transposed into Spanish Law by Organic Law No 15/1999 of 13 December 1999 on
the protection of personal data (BOE No 298 of 14 December 1999, p. 43088).

The dispute in the main proceedings and the questions referred for a preliminary ruling

14. On 5 March 2010, Mr Costeja González, a Spanish national resident in Spain, lodged with the AEPD a complaint against La Vanguardia Ediciones SL, which publishes a daily newspaper with a large circulation, in particular in Catalonia (Spain) (“La Vanguardia”), and against Google Spain and Google Inc. The complaint was based on the fact that, when an internet user entered Mr Costeja González’s name in the search engine of the Google group (“Google Search”), he would obtain links to two pages of La Vanguardia’s newspaper, of 19 January and 9 March 1998 respectively, on which an announcement mentioning Mr Costeja González’s name appeared for a real-estate auction connected with attachment proceedings for the recovery of social security debts.

15. By that complaint, Mr Costeja González requested, first, that La Vanguardia be required either to remove or alter those pages so that the personal data relating to him no longer appeared or to use certain tools made available by search engines in order to protect the data. Second, he requested that Google Spain or Google Inc. be required to remove or conceal the personal data relating to him so that they ceased to be included in the search results and no longer appeared in the links to La Vanguardia. Mr Costeja González stated in this context that the attachment proceedings concerning him had been fully resolved for a number of years and that reference to them was now entirely irrelevant.

16. By decision of 30 July 2010, the AEPD rejected the complaint in so far as it related to La Vanguardia, taking the view that the publication by it of the information in question was legally justified as it took place upon order of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and was intended to give maximum publicity to the auction in order to secure as many bidders as possible.

17. On the other hand, the complaint was upheld in so far as it was directed against Google Spain and Google Inc. The AEPD considered in this regard that operators of search engines are subject to data protection legislation given that they carry out data processing for which they are responsible and act as intermediaries in the information society. The AEPD took the view that it has the power to require the withdrawal of data and the prohibition of access to certain data by the operators of search engines when it considers that the locating and dissemination of the data are liable to compromise the fundamental right to data protection and the dignity of persons in the broad sense, and this would also encompass the mere wish of the person concerned that such data not be known to third parties. The AEPD considered that that obligation may be owed directly by operators of search engines, without it being necessary to erase the data or information from the website where they appear, including when retention of the information on that site is justified by a statutory provision.

18. Google Spain and Google Inc. brought separate actions against that decision before the Audiencia Nacional (National High Court). The Audiencia Nacional joined the actions.

19. That court states in the order for reference that the actions raise the question of what obligations are owed by operators of search engines to protect personal data of persons concerned who do not wish that certain information, which is published on third parties’ websites and contains personal data relating to them that enable that information to be linked to them, be located, indexed and made available to internet users indefinitely. The answer to that question depends on the way in which Directive 95/46 must be interpreted in the context of these technologies, which appeared after the directive’s publication.

20. In those circumstances, the Audiencia Nacional decided to stay the proceedings and to refer the following questions to the Court for a preliminary ruling:

‘1. With regard to the territorial application of Directive [95/46] and, consequently, of the Spanish data protection legislation:

(a) must it be considered that an “establishment”, within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46, exists when any one or more of the following circumstances arise:
– when the undertaking providing the search engine sets up in a Member State an office or subsidiary for the purpose of promoting and selling advertising space on the search engine, which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that State, or
– when the parent company designates a subsidiary located in that Member State as its representative and controller for two specific filing systems which relate to the data of customers who have contracted for advertising with that undertaking, or
– when the office or subsidiary established in a Member State forwards to the parent company, located outside the European Union, requests and requirements addressed to it both by data subjects and by the authorities with responsibility for ensuring observation of the right to data protection, even where such collaboration is engaged in voluntarily?

(b) Must Article 4(1)(c) of Directive 95/46 be interpreted as meaning that there is “use of equipment ... situated on the territory of the said Member State”:
– when a search engine uses crawlers or robots to locate and index information contained in web pages located on servers in that Member State, or
– when it uses a domain name pertaining to a Member State and arranges for searches and the results thereof to be based on the language of that Member State?

(c) Is it possible to regard as a use of equipment, in the terms of Article 4(1)(c) of Directive 95/46, the temporary storage of the information indexed by internet search engines? If the answer to that question is affirmative, can it be considered that that connecting
factor is present when the undertaking refuses to disclose the place where it stores those indexes, invoking reasons of competition?

(d) Regardless of the answers to the foregoing questions and particularly in the event that the Court ... considers that the connecting factors referred to in Article 4 of [Directive 95/46] are not present:

must Directive 95/46 ... be applied, in the light of Article 8 of the [Charter], in the Member State where the centre of gravity of the conflict is located and more effective protection of the rights of ... Union citizens is possible?

2. As regards the activity of search engines as providers of content in relation to Directive 95/46 ....

(a) in relation to the activity of [Google Search] as a provider of content, consisting in locating information published or included on the net by third parties, indexing it automatically, storing it temporarily and finally making it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference, when that information contains personal data of third parties:

must an activity like the one described be interpreted as falling within the concept of "processing of ... data" used in Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46?

(b) If the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative, and once again in relation to an activity like the one described:

must Article 2(d) of Directive 95/46 be interpreted as meaning that the undertaking managing [Google Search] is to be regarded as the "controller" of the personal data contained in the web pages that it indexes?

(c) In the event that the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative:

may the [AEPD], protecting the rights embodied in [Article] 12(b) and [subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14] of Directive 95/46, directly impose on [Google Search] a requirement that it withdraw from its indexes an item of information published or included on the net by third parties, without addressing itself in advance or simultaneously to the owner of the web page on which that information is located?

(d) In the event that the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative:

would the obligation of search engines to protect those rights be excluded when the information that contains the personal data has been lawfully published by third parties and is kept on the web page from which it originates?

3. Regarding the scope of the right of erasure and/or the right to object, in relation to the "derecho al olvido" (the "right to be forgotten"), the following question is asked:

must it be considered that the rights to erasure and blocking of data, provided for in Article 12(b), and the right to object, provided for by [subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14] of Directive 95/46, extend to enabling the data subject to address himself to search engines in order to prevent indexing of the information relating to him personally, published on third parties’ web pages, invoking his wish that such information should not be known to internet users when he considers that it might be prejudicial to him or he wishes it to be consigned to oblivion, even though the information in question has been lawfully published by third parties?'

Consideration of the questions referred

Question 2(a) and (b), concerning the material scope of Directive 95/46

21. By Question 2(a) and (b), which it is appropriate to examine first, the referring court asks, in essence, whether Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 is to be interpreted as meaning that the activity of a search engine as a provider of content which consists in finding information published or placed on the internet by third parties, indexing it automatically, storing it temporarily and, finally, making it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference must be classified as ‘processing of personal data’ within the meaning of that provision when that information contains personal data. If the answer is in the affirmative, the referring court seeks to ascertain furthermore whether Article 2(d) of Directive 95/46 is to be interpreted as meaning that the operator of a search engine must be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of that processing of the personal data, within the meaning of that provision.

22. According to Google Spain and Google Inc., the activity of search engines cannot be regarded as processing of the data which appear on third parties’ web pages displayed in the list of search results, given that search engines process all the information available on the internet without effecting a selection between personal data and other information. Furthermore, even if that activity must be classified as ‘data processing’, the operator of a search engine cannot be regarded as a ‘controller’ in respect of that processing since it has no knowledge of those data and does not exercise control over the data.

23. On the other hand, Mr Costeja González, the Spanish, Italian, Austrian and Polish Governments and the European Commission consider that that activity quite clearly involves ‘data processing’ within the meaning of Directive 95/46, which is distinct from the data processing by the publishers of websites and pursues different objectives from such processing. The operator of a search engine is the ‘controller’ in respect of the data processing carried out by it since it is the operator that determines the purposes and means of that processing.

24. In the Greek Government’s submission, the activity in question constitutes such ‘processing’, but inasmuch as search engines serve merely as intermediaries, the undertakings which operate them cannot be regarded as ‘controllers’, except where they store data in an ‘intermediate memory’ or ‘cache memory’ for a period which exceeds that which is technically necessary.

25. Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 defines ‘processing of personal data’ as ‘any operation or set of operations which is performed upon personal data, whether or not by automatic means, such as collection, recording, organisation, storage, adaptation or alteration, retrieval,
consultation, use, disclosure by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available, alignment or combination, blocking, erasure or destruction’.

26. As regards in particular the internet, the Court has already had occasion to state that the operation of loading personal data on an internet page must be considered to be such ‘processing’ within the meaning of Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 (see Case C-101/01 Lindqvist EU:C:2003:596, paragraph 25).

27. So far as concerns the activity at issue in the main proceedings, it is not contested that the data found, indexed and stored by search engines and made available to their users include information relating to identified or identifiable natural persons and thus ‘personal data’ within the meaning of Article 2(a) of that directive.

28. Therefore, it must be found that, in exploring the internet automatically, constantly and systematically in search of the information which is published there, the operator of a search engine ‘collects’ such data which it subsequently ‘retrieves’, ‘records’ and ‘organises’ within the framework of its indexing programmes, ‘stores’ on its servers and, as the case may be, ‘discloses’ and ‘makes available’ to its users in the form of lists of search results. As those operations are referred to expressly and unconditionally in Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46, they must be classified as ‘processing’ within the meaning of that provision, regardless of the fact that the operator of the search engine also carries out the same operations in respect of other types of information and does not distinguish between the latter and the personal data.

29. Nor is the foregoing finding affected by the fact that those data have already been published on the internet and are not altered by the search engine.

30. The Court has already held that the operations referred to in Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 must also be classified as such processing where they exclusively concern material that has already been published in unaltered form in the media. It has indeed observed in that regard that a general derogation from the application of Directive 95/46 in such a case would largely deprive the directive of its effect (see, to this effect, Case C-73/07 Satakanunan Markkinapörssi and Satamedia EU:C:2008:727, paragraphs 48 and 49).

31. Furthermore, it follows from the definition contained in Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 that, whilst the alteration of personal data indeed constitutes processing within the meaning of the directive, the other operations which are mentioned there do not, on the other hand, in any way require that the personal data be altered.

32. As to the question whether the operator of a search engine must be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of the processing of personal data that is carried out by that engine in the context of an activity such as that at issue in the main proceedings, it should be recalled that Article 2(d) of Directive 95/46 defines ‘controller’ as ‘the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or any other body which alone or jointly with others determines the purposes and means of the processing of personal data’.

33. It is the search engine operator which determines the purposes and means of that activity and thus of the processing of personal data that it itself carries out within the framework of that activity and which must, consequently, be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of that processing pursuant to Article 2(d).

34. Furthermore, it would be contrary not only to the clear wording of that provision but also to its objective — which is to ensure, through a broad definition of the concept of ‘controller’, effective and complete protection of data subjects — to exclude the operator of a search engine from that definition on the ground that it does not exercise control over the personal data published on the web pages of third parties.

35. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the processing of personal data carried out in the context of the activity of a search engine can be distinguished from and is additional to that carried out by publishers of websites, consisting in loading those data on an internet page.

36. Moreover, it is undisputed that that activity of search engines plays a decisive role in the overall dissemination of those data in that it renders the latter accessible to any internet user making a search on the basis of the data subject’s name, including to internet users who otherwise would not have found the web page on which those data are published.

37. Also, the organisation and aggregation of information published on the internet that are effected by search engines with the aim of facilitating their users’ access to that information may, when users carry out their search on the basis of an individual’s name, result in them obtaining through the list of results a structured overview of the information relating to that individual that can be found on the internet enabling them to establish a more or less detailed profile of the data subject.

38. Inasmuch as the activity of a search engine is therefore liable to affect significantly, and additionally compared with that of the publishers of websites, the fundamental rights to privacy and to the protection of personal data, the operator of the search engine as the person determining the purposes and means of that activity must ensure, within the framework of its responsibilities, powers and capabilities, that the activity meets the requirements of Directive 95/46 in order that the guarantees laid down by the directive may have full effect and that effective and complete protection of data subjects, in particular of their right to privacy, may actually be achieved.

39. Finally, the fact that publishers of websites have the option of indicating to operators of search engines, by means in particular of exclusion protocols such as ‘robot.txt’ or codes such as ‘noindex’ or ‘noarchivize’, that they wish specific information published on their site to be wholly or partially excluded from the search engines’ automatic indexes does not mean that, if publishers of websites do not so indicate, the operator of a search engine is released from its responsibility for...
the processing of personal data that it carries out in the context of the engine’s activity.

40. That fact does not alter the position that the purposes and means of that processing are determined by the operator of the search engine. Furthermore, even if that option for publishers of websites were to mean that they determine the means of that processing jointly with that operator, this finding would not remove any of the latter’s responsibility as Article 2(d) of Directive 95/46 expressly provides that that determination may be made ‘alone or jointly with others’.

41. It follows from all the foregoing considerations that the answer to Question 2(a) and (b) is that Article 2(b) and (d) of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, first, the activity of a search engine consisting in finding information published or placed on the internet by third parties, indexing it automatically, storing it temporarily and, finally, making it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference must be classified as ‘processing of personal data’ within the meaning of Article 2(b) when that information contains personal data and, second, the operator of the search engine must be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of that processing, within the meaning of Article 2(d).

**Question 1(a) to (d), concerning the territorial scope of Directive 95/46**

42. By Question 1(a) to (d), the referring court seeks to establish whether it is possible to apply the national legislation transposing Directive 95/46 in circumstances such as those at issue in the main proceedings.

43. In this respect, the referring court has established the following facts:

- Google Search is offered worldwide through the website ‘www.google.com’. In numerous States, a local version adapted to the national language exists. The version of Google Search in Spanish is offered through the website ‘www.google.es’, which has been registered since 16 September 2003. Google Search is one of the most used search engines in Spain.

- Google Search is operated by Google Inc., which is the parent company of the Google Group and has its seat in the United States.

- Google Search indexes websites throughout the world, including websites located in Spain. The information indexed by its ‘web crawlers’ or robots, that is to say, computer programmes used to locate and sweep up the content of web pages methodically and automatically, is stored temporarily on servers whose State of location is unknown, that being kept secret for reasons of competition.

- Google Search does not merely give access to content hosted on the indexed websites, but takes advantage of that activity and includes, in return for payment, advertising associated with the internet users’ search terms, for undertakings which wish to use that tool in order to offer their goods or services to the internet users.

- The Google group has recourse to its subsidiary Google Spain for promoting the sale of advertising space generated on the website ‘www.google.com’. Google Spain, which was established on 3 September 2003 and possesses separate legal personality, has its seat in Madrid (Spain). Its activities are targeted essentially at undertakings based in Spain, acting as a commercial agent for the Google group in that Member State. Its objects are to promote, facilitate and effect the sale of on-line advertising products and services to third parties and the marketing of that advertising.

- Google Inc. designated Google Spain as the controller, in Spain, in respect of two filing systems registered by Google Inc. with the AEPD; those filing systems were intended to contain the personal data of the customers who had concluded contracts for advertising services with Google Inc.

44. Specifically, the main issues raised by the referring court concern the notion of ‘establishment’, within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46, and of ‘use of equipment situated on the territory of the said Member State’, within the meaning of Article 4(1)(c).

**Question 1(a)**

45. By Question 1(a), the referring court asks, in essence, whether Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46 is to be interpreted as meaning that processing of personal data is carried out in the context of the activities of an establishment of the controller on the territory of a Member State, within the meaning of that provision, when one or more of the following three conditions are met:

- the operator of a search engine sets up in a Member State a branch or subsidiary which is intended to promote and sell advertising space offered by that engine and which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that Member State, or

- the parent company designates a subsidiary located in that Member State as its representative and controller for two specific filing systems which relate to the data of customers who have contracted for advertising with that undertaking, or

- the branch or subsidiary established in a Member State forwards to the parent company, located outside the European Union, requests and requirements addressed to it both by data subjects and by the authorities with responsibility for ensuring observation of the right to protection of personal data, even where such collaboration is engaged in voluntarily.

46. So far as concerns the first of those three conditions, the referring court states that Google Search is operated and managed by Google Inc. and that it has not been established that Google Spain carries out in Spain an activity directly linked to the indexing or storage of information or data contained on third parties’ websites. Nevertheless, according to the referring court, the promotion and sale of advertising space, which Google Spain attends to in respect of Spain, constitutes the bulk of the Google group’s commercial activity and may be regarded as closely linked to Google Search.

47. Mr Costeja González, the Spanish, Italian, Austrian and Polish Governments and the Commission submit that, in the light of the inextricable link between the
the processing of personal data for the purposes of the service of a search engine such as Google Search, which is operated by an undertaking that has its seat in a third State but has an establishment in a Member State, is carried out ‘in the context of the activities’ of that establishment if the latter is intended to promote and sell, in that Member State, advertising space offered by the search engine which serves to make the service offered by that engine profitable.

56. In such circumstances, the activities of the operator of the search engine and those of its establishment situated in the Member State concerned are inextricably linked since the activities relating to the advertising space constitute the means of rendering the search engine at issue economically profitable and that engine is, at the same time, the means enabling those activities to be performed.

57. As has been stated in paragraphs 26 to 28 of the present judgment, the very display of personal data on a search results page constitutes processing of such data. Since that display of results is accompanied, on the same page, by the display of advertising linked to the search terms, it is clear that the processing of personal data in question is carried out in the context of the commercial and advertising activity of the controller’s establishment on the territory of a Member State, in this instance Spanish territory.

58. That being so, it cannot be accepted that the processing of personal data carried out for the purposes of the operation of the search engine should escape the obligations and guarantees laid down by Directive 95/46, which would compromise the directive’s effectiveness and the effective and complete protection of the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons which the directive seeks to ensure (see, by analogy, L’Oréal and Others EU:C:2011:474, paragraphs 62 and 63), in particular their right to privacy, with respect to the processing of personal data, a right to which the directive accords special importance as is confirmed in particular by Article 1(1) thereof and recitals 2 and 10 in its preamble (see, to this effect, Joined Cases C-465/00, C-138/01 and C-139/01 Österreichischer Rundfunk and Others EU:C:2003:294, paragraph 70; Case C-553/07 Rijkeboer EU:C:2009:293, paragraph 47; and Case C-473/12 IPI EU:C:2013:715, paragraph 28 and the case-law cited).

59. Since the first of the three conditions listed by the referring court suffices by itself for it to be concluded that an establishment such as Google Spain satisfies the criterion laid down in Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46, it is unnecessary to examine the other two conditions.

60. It follows from the foregoing that the answer to Question 1(a) is that Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46 is to be interpreted as meaning that processing of personal data is carried out in the context of the activities of an establishment of the controller on the territory of a Member State, within the meaning of that provision, when the operator of a search engine sets up in a Member State a branch or subsidiary which is...
intended to promote and sell advertising space offered by that engine and which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that Member State.

**Question 1(b) to (d)**

61. In view of the answer given to Question 1(a), there is no need to answer Question 1(b) to (d).

62. By Question 2(c) and (d), the referring court asks, in essence, whether Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, in order to comply with the rights laid down in those provisions, the operator of a search engine is obliged to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name links to web pages, published by third parties and containing information relating to that person, also in a case where that name or information is not erased beforehand or simultaneously from those web pages, and even, as the case may be, when its publication in itself on those pages is lawful.

63. Google Spain and Google Inc. submit that, by virtue of the principle of proportionality, any request seeking the removal of information must be addressed to the publisher of the website concerned because it is he who takes the responsibility for making the information public, who is in a position to appraise the lawfulness of that publication and who has available to him the most effective and least restrictive means of making the information inaccessible. Furthermore, to require the operator of a search engine to withdraw information published on the internet from its indexes would take insufficient account of the fundamental rights of publishers of websites, of other internet users and of that operator itself.

64. According to the Austrian Government, a national supervisory authority may order such an operator to erase information published by third parties from its filing systems only if the data in question have been found previously to be unlawful or incorrect or if the data subject has made a successful objection to the publisher of the website on which that information was published.

65. Mr Costeja González, the Spanish, Italian and Polish Governments and the Commission submit that the national authority may directly order the operator of a search engine to withdraw from its indexes and intermediate memory information containing personal data that has been published by third parties, without having to approach beforehand or simultaneously the publisher of the web page on which that information appears. Furthermore, according to Mr Costeja González, the Spanish and Italian Governments and the Commission, the fact that the information has been published lawfully and that it still appears on the original web page has no effect on the obligations of that operator under Directive 95/46. On the other hand, according to the Polish Government that fact is such as to release the operator from its obligations.

66. First of all, it should be remembered that, as is apparent from Article 1 and recital 10 in the preamble, Directive 95/46 seeks to ensure a high level of protection of the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons, in particular their right to privacy, with respect to the processing of personal data (see, to this effect, IP1 EU:C:2013:715, paragraph 28).

67. According to recital 25 in the preamble to Directive 95/46, the principles of protection laid down by the directive are reflected, on the one hand, in the obligations imposed on persons responsible for processing, in particular regarding data quality, technical security, notification to the supervisory authority and the circumstances under which processing can be carried out, and, on the other hand, in the rights conferred on individuals whose data are the subject of processing to be informed that processing is taking place, to consult the data, to request corrections and even to object to processing in certain circumstances.

68. The Court has already held that the provisions of Directive 95/46, in so far as they govern the processing of personal data liable to infringe fundamental freedoms, in particular the right to privacy, must necessarily be interpreted in the light of fundamental rights, which, according to settled case-law, form an integral part of the general principles of law whose observance the Court ensures and which are now set out in the Charter (see, in particular, Case C-274/99 P Connolly v Commission EU:C:2001:127, paragraph 37, and Österreichischer Rundfunk and Others EU:C:2003:294, paragraph 68).

69. Article 7 of the Charter guarantees the right to respect for private life, whilst Article 8 of the Charter expressly proclaims the right to the protection of personal data. Article 8(2) and (3) specify that such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid down by law, that everyone has the right of access to data which have been collected concerning him or her and the right to have the data rectified, and that compliance with these rules is to be subject to control by an independent authority. Those requirements are implemented inter alia by Articles 6, 7, 12, 14 and 28 of Directive 95/46.

70. Article 12(b) of Directive 95/46 provides that Member States are to guarantee every data subject the right to obtain from the controller, as appropriate, the rectification, erasure or blocking of data the processing of which does not comply with the provisions of Directive 95/46, in particular because of the incomplete or inaccurate nature of the data. As this final point relating to the case where certain requirements referred to in Article 6(1)(d) of Directive 95/46 are not observed is stated by way of example and is not exhaustive, it follows that non-compliant nature of the processing, which is capable of conferring upon the data subject the right guaranteed in Article 12(b) of the directive, may also arise from non-observance of the other conditions of lawfulness that are imposed by the directive upon the processing of personal data.
71. In this connection, it should be noted that, subject to the exceptions permitted under Article 13 of Directive 95/46, all processing of personal data must comply, first, with the principles relating to data quality set out in Article 6 of the directive and, secondly, with one of the criteria for making data processing legitimate listed in Article 7 of the directive (see Österreichischer Rundfunk and Others EU:C:2003:294, paragraph 65; Joined Cases C-468/10 and C-469/10 ASNEF and FECEMD EU:C:2011:777, paragraph 26; and Case C-342/12 Worten EU:C:2013:355, paragraph 33).

72. Under Article 6 of Directive 95/46 and without prejudice to specific provisions that the Member States may lay down in respect of processing for historical, statistical or scientific purposes, the controller has the task of ensuring that personal data are processed ‘fairly and lawfully’, that they are ‘collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes and not further processed in a way incompatible with those purposes’, that they are ‘adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purposes for which they are collected and/or further processed’, that they are ‘accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date’ and, finally, that they are ‘kept in a form which permits identification of data subjects for no longer than is necessary for the purposes for which the data were collected or for which they are further processed’. In this context, the controller must take every reasonable step to ensure that data which do not meet the requirements of that provision are erased or rectified.

73. As regards legitimation, under Article 7 of Directive 95/46, of processing such as that at issue in the main proceedings carried out by the operator of a search engine, that processing is capable of being covered by the ground in Article 7(f).

74. This provision permits the processing of personal data where it is necessary for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by the third party or parties to whom the data are disclosed, except where such interests are overridden by the interests or fundamental rights and freedoms of the data subject — in particular his right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data — which require protection under Article 1(1) of the directive. Application of Article 7(f) thus necessitates a balancing of the opposing rights and interests concerned, in the context of which account must be taken of the significance of the data subject’s rights arising from Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter (see ASNEF and FECEMD, EU:C:2011:777, paragraphs 38 and 40).

75. Whilst the question whether the processing complies with Articles 6 and 7(f) of Directive 95/46 may be determined in the context of a request as provided for in Article 12(b) of the directive, the data subject may, in addition, rely in certain conditions on the right to object laid down in subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of the directive.

76. Under subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46, Member States are to grant the data subject the right, at least in the cases referred to in Article 7(e) and (f) of the directive, to object at any time on compelling legitimate grounds relating to his particular situation to the processing of data relating to him, save where otherwise provided by national legislation. The balancing to be carried out under subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 thus enables account to be taken in a more specific manner of all the circumstances surrounding the data subject’s particular situation. Where there is a justified objection, the processing instigated by the controller may no longer involve those data.

77. Requests under Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 may be addressed by the data subject directly to the controller who must then duly examine their merits and, as the case may be, end processing of the data in question. Where the controller does not grant the request, the data subject may bring the matter before the supervisory authority or the judicial authority so that it carries out the necessary checks and orders the controller to take specific measures accordingly.

78. In this connection, it is to be noted that it is clear from Article 28(3) and (4) of Directive 95/46 that each supervisory authority is to hear claims lodged by any person concerning the protection of his rights and freedoms in regard to the processing of personal data and that it has investigative powers and effective powers of intervention enabling it to order in particular the blocking, erasure or destruction of data or to impose a temporary or definitive ban on such processing.

79. It is in the light of those considerations that it is necessary to interpret and apply the provisions of Directive 95/46 governing the data subject’s rights when he lodges with the supervisory authority or judicial authority a request such as that at issue in the main proceedings.

80. It must be pointed out at the outset that, as has been found in paragraphs 36 to 38 of the present judgment, processing of personal data, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, carried out by the operator of a search engine is liable to affect significantly the fundamental rights to privacy and to the protection of personal data when the search by means of that engine is carried out on the basis of an individual’s name, since that processing enables any internet user to obtain through the list of results a structured overview of the information relating to that individual that can be found on the internet — information which potentially concerns a vast number of aspects of his private life and which, without the search engine, could not have been interconnected or could have been only with great difficulty — and thereby to establish a more or less detailed profile of him. Furthermore, the effect of the interference with those rights of the data subject is heightened on account of the important role played by the internet and search engines in modern society, which render the information contained in such a list of results ubiquitous (see, to this effect, Joined Cases C-509/09 and C-161/10 eDate Advertising and Others EU:C:2011:685, paragraph 45).
81. In the light of the potential seriousness of that interference, it is clear that it cannot be justified by merely the economic interest which the operator of such an engine has in that processing. However, inasmuch as the removal of links from the list of results could, depending on the information at issue, have effects upon the legitimate interest of internet users potentially interested in having access to that information, in situations such as that at issue in the main proceedings a fair balance should be sought in particular between that interest and the data subject’s fundamental rights under Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter. Whilst it is true that the data subject’s rights protected by those articles also override, as a general rule, that interest of internet users, that balance may however depend, in specific cases, on the nature of the information in question and its sensitivity for the data subject’s private life and on the interest of the public in having that information, an interest which may vary, in particular, according to the role played by the data subject in public life.

82. Following the appraisal of the conditions for the application of Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 which is to be carried out when a request such as that at issue in the main proceedings is lodged with it, the supervisory authority or judicial authority may order the operator of the search engine to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name links to web pages published by third parties containing information relating to that person, without an order to that effect presupposing the previous or simultaneous removal of that name and information — of the publisher’s own accord or following an order of one of those authorities — from the web page on which they were published.

83. As has been established in paragraphs 35 to 38 of the present judgment, inasmuch as the data processing carried out in the context of the activity of a search engine can be distinguished from and is additional to that carried out by publishers of websites and affects the data subject’s fundamental rights additionally, the operator of the search engine as the controller in respect of that processing must ensure, within the framework of its responsibilities, powers and capabilities, that that processing meets the requirements of Directive 95/46, in order that the guarantees laid down by the directive may have full effect.

84. Given the ease with which information published on a website can be replicated on other sites and the fact that the persons responsible for its publication are not always subject to European Union legislation, effective and complete protection of data users could not be achieved if the latter had to obtain first or in parallel the erasure of the information relating to them from the publishers of websites.

85. Furthermore, the processing by the publisher of a web page consisting in the publication of information relating to an individual may, in some circumstances, be carried out ‘solely for journalistic purposes’ and thus benefit, by virtue of Article 9 of Directive 95/46, from derogations from the requirements laid down by the directive, whereas that does not appear to be so in the case of the processing carried out by the operator of a search engine. It cannot therefore be ruled out that in certain circumstances the data subject is capable of exercising the rights referred to in Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 against that operator but not against the publisher of the web page.

86. Finally, it must be stated that not only does the ground, under Article 7 of Directive 95/46, justifying the publication of a piece of personal data on a website not necessarily coincide with that which is applicable to the activity of search engines, but also, even where that is the case, the outcome of the weighing of the interests at issue to be carried out under Article 7(f) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of the directive may differ according to whether the processing carried out by the operator of a search engine or that carried out by the publisher of the web page is at issue, given that, first, the legitimate interests justifying the processing may be different and, second, the consequences of the processing for the data subject, and in particular for his private life, are not necessarily the same.

87. Indeed, since the inclusion in the list of results, displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name, of a web page and of the information contained on it relating to that person makes access to that information appreciably easier for any internet user making a search in respect of the person concerned and may play a decisive role in the dissemination of that information, it is liable to constitute a more significant interference with the data subject’s fundamental right to privacy than the publication on the web page.

88. In the light of all the foregoing considerations, the answer to Question 2(c) and (d) is that Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, in order to comply with the rights laid down in those provisions and in so far as the conditions laid down by those provisions are in fact satisfied, the operator of a search engine is obliged to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name links to web pages, published by third parties and containing information relating to that person, also in a case where that name or information is not erased beforehand or simultaneously from those web pages, and even, as the case may be, when its publication in itself on those pages is lawful.

**Question 3, concerning the scope of the data subject’s rights guaranteed by Directive 95/46**

89. By Question 3, the referring court asks, in essence, whether Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as enabling the data subject to require the operator of a search engine to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name links to web pages published lawfully by third parties and containing true information relating to
him, on the ground that that information may be prejudicial to him or that he wishes it to be ‘forgotten’ after a certain time.

90. Google Spain, Google Inc., the Greek, Austrian and Polish Governments and the Commission consider that this question should be answered in the negative. Google Spain, Google Inc., the Polish Government and the Commission submit in this regard that Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 confer rights upon data subjects only if the processing in question is incompatible with the directive or on compelling legitimate grounds relating to their particular situation, and not merely because they consider that that processing may be prejudicial to them or they wish that the data being processed sink into oblivion. The Greek and Austrian Governments submit that the data subject must approach the publisher of the website concerned.

91. According to Mr Costeja González and the Spanish and Italian Governments, the data subject may oppose the indexing by a search engine of personal data relating to him where their dissemination through the search engine is prejudicial to him and his fundamental rights to the protection of those data and to privacy — which encompass the ‘right to be forgotten’ — override the legitimate interests of the operator of the search engine and the general interest in freedom of information.

92. As regards Article 12(b) of Directive 95/46, the application of which is subject to the condition that the processing of personal data be incompatible with the directive, it should be recalled that, as has been noted in paragraph 72 of the present judgment, such incompatibility may result not only from the fact that such data are inaccurate but, in particular, also from the fact that they are inadequate, irrelevant or excessive in relation to the purposes of the processing, that they are not kept up to date, or that they are kept for longer than is necessary unless they are required to be kept for historical, statistical or scientific purposes.

93. It follows from those requirements, laid down in Article 6(1)(c) to (e) of Directive 95/46, that even initially lawful processing of accurate data may, in the course of time, become incompatible with the directive where those data are no longer necessary in the light of the purposes for which they were collected or processed. That is so in particular where they appear to be inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant, or excessive in relation to those purposes and in the light of the time that has elapsed.

94. Therefore, if it is found, following a request by the data subject pursuant to Article 12(b) of Directive 95/46, that the inclusion in the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name and containing true information relating to him personally is, at this point in time, incompatible with Article 6(1)(c) to (e) of the directive because that information appears, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, to be inadequate, irrelevant or no longer relevant, or excessive in relation to the purposes of the processing at issue carried out by the operator of the search engine, the information and links concerned in the list of results must be erased.

95. So far as concerns requests as provided for by Article 12(b) of Directive 95/46 founded on alleged non-compliance with the conditions laid down in Article 7(f) of the directive and requests under subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of the directive, it must be pointed out that in each case the processing of personal data must be authorised under Article 7 for the entire period during which it is carried out.

96. In the light of the foregoing, when appraising such requests made in order to oppose processing such as that at issue in the main proceedings, it should in particular be examined whether the data subject has a right that the information relating to him personally should, at this point in time, no longer be linked to his name by a list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name. In this connection, it must be pointed out that it is not necessary in order to find such a right that the inclusion of the information in question in the list of results causes prejudice to the data subject.

97. As the data subject may, in the light of his fundamental rights under Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter, request that the information in question no longer be made available to the general public by its inclusion in such a list of results, it should be held, as follows in particular from paragraph 81 of the present judgment, that those rights override, as a rule, not only the economic interest of the operator of the search engine but also the interest of the general public in finding that information upon a search relating to the data subject’s name. However, that would not be the case if it appeared, for particular reasons, such as the role played by the data subject in public life, that the interference with his fundamental rights is justified by the preponderant interest of the general public in having, on account of inclusion in the list of results, access to the information in question.

98. As regards a situation such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which concerns the display, in the list of results that the internet user obtains by making a search by means of Google Search on the basis of the data subject’s name, of links to pages of the on-line archives of a daily newspaper that contain announcements mentioning the data subject’s name and relating to a real-estate auction connected with attachment proceedings for the recovery of social security debts, it should be held that, having regard to the sensitivity for the data subject’s private life of the information contained in those announcements and to the fact that its initial publication had taken place 16 years earlier, the data subject establishes a right that that information should no longer be linked to his name by means of such a list. Accordingly, since in the case in point there do not appear to be particular reasons substantiating a preponderant interest of the public in having, in the context of such a search, access to that information, a matter which is, however, for the
referring court to establish, the data subject may, by virtue of Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46, require those links to be removed from the list of results.

99. It follows from the foregoing considerations that the answer to Question 3 is that Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, when appraising the conditions for the application of those provisions, it should inter alia be examined whether the data subject has a right that the information in question relating to him personally should, at this point in time, no longer be linked to his name by a list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name, without it being necessary in order to find such a right that the inclusion of the information in question in that list causes prejudice to the data subject.

As the data subject may, in the light of his fundamental rights under Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter, request that the information in question no longer be made available to the general public on account of its inclusion in such a list of results, those rights override, as a rule, not only the economic interest of the operator of the search engine but also the interest of the general public in having access to that information upon a search relating to the data subject’s name. However, that would not be the case if it appeared, for particular reasons, such as the role played by the data subject in public life, that the interference with his fundamental rights is justified by the preponderant interest of the general public in having, on account of its inclusion in the list of results, access to the information in question.

Costs

100. Since these proceedings are, for the parties to the main proceedings, a step in the action pending before the referring court, the decision on costs is a matter for that court. Costs incurred in submitting observations to the Court, other than the costs of those parties, are not recoverable.

On those grounds, the Court (Grand Chamber) hereby rules:

1. Article 2(b) and (d) of Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data are to be interpreted as meaning that, first, the activity of a search engine consisting in finding information published or placed on the internet by third parties, indexing it automatically, storing it temporarily and, finally, making it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference must be classified as ‘processing of personal data’ within the meaning of Article 2(b) when that information contains personal data and, second, the operator of the search engine must be regarded as the ‘controller’ in respect of that processing, within the meaning of Article 2(d).

2. Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46 is to be interpreted as meaning that processing of personal data is carried out in the context of the activities of an establishment of the controller on the territory of a Member State, within the meaning of that provision, when the operator of a search engine sets up in a Member State a branch or subsidiary which is intended to promote and sell advertising space offered by that engine and which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that Member State.

3. Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, in order to comply with the rights laid down in those provisions and in so far as the conditions laid down by those provisions are in fact satisfied, the operator of a search engine is obliged to remove from the list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of a person’s name links to web pages, published by third parties and containing information relating to that person, also in a case where that name or information is not erased beforehand or simultaneously from those web pages, and even, as the case may be, when its publication in itself on those pages is lawful.

4. Article 12(b) and subparagraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 of Directive 95/46 are to be interpreted as meaning that, when appraising the conditions for the application of those provisions, it should inter alia be examined whether the data subject has a right that the information in question relating to him personally should, at this point in time, no longer be linked to his name by a list of results displayed following a search made on the basis of his name, without it being necessary in order to find such a right that the inclusion of the information in question in that list causes prejudice to the data subject. As the data subject may, in the light of his fundamental rights under Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter, request that the information in question no longer be made available to the general public on account of its inclusion in such a list of results, those rights override, as a rule, not only the economic interest of the operator of the search engine but also the interest of the general public in having access to that information upon a search relating to the data subject’s name. However, that would not be the case if it appeared, for particular reasons, such as the role played by the data subject in public life, that the interference with his fundamental rights is justified by the preponderant interest of the general public in having, on account of its inclusion in the list of results, access to the information in question.

* Language of the case: Spanish.
(World Wide Web – Personal data – Internet search engine – Data Protection Directive 95/46 – Interpretation of Articles 2(b) and 2(d), 4(1)(a) and 4(1)(c), 12(b) and 14(a) – Territorial scope of application – Concept of an establishment on the territory of a Member State – Scope of application ratione materiae – Concept of processing of personal data – Concept of a controller of processing of personal data – Right to erasure and blocking of data – ‘Right to be forgotten’ – Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union – Articles 7, 8, 11 and 16)

I – Introduction

1. In 1890, in their seminal Harvard Law Review article ‘The Right to Privacy’, (2) Samuel D. Warren and Louis D. Brandeis lamented that ‘[r]ecent inventions and business methods’ such as ‘[i]instantaneous photographs and newspaper enterprise have invaded the sacred precincts of private and domestic life’. In the same article they referred ‘to the next step which must be taken for the protection of the person.’

2. Nowadays, protecting personal data and privacy of individuals has become increasingly important. Any content including personal data, be it in the form of texts or audiovisual materials, can instantly and permanently be made accessible in digital format world wide. The internet has revolutionised our lives by removing technical and institutional barriers to dissemination and reception of information, and has created a platform for various information society services. These benefit consumers, undertakings and society at large. This has given rise to unprecedented circumstances in which a balance has to be struck between various fundamental rights, such as freedom of expression, freedom of information and freedom to conduct a business, on one hand, and protection of personal data and the privacy of individuals, on the other.

3. In the context of the internet, three situations should be distinguished that relate to personal data. The first is the publishing of elements of personal data on any web page, as in the source web page (3) (the ‘source web page’). (4) The second is the case where an internet search engine provides search results that direct the internet user to the source web page. The third, more invisible operation occurs when an internet user performs a search using an internet search engine, and some of his personal data, such as the IP address from which the search is made, are automatically transferred to the internet search engine service provider. (5)

4. As regards the first situation, the Court has already held in Lindqvist that Directive 95/46/EC (6) (hereinafter ‘the Data Protection Directive’ or ‘the Directive’) applies to this situation. The third situation is not at issue in the present proceedings, and there are ongoing administrative procedures initiated by national data protection authorities to clarify the scope of application of the EU data protection rules to the users of internet search engines. (7)

5. The order for reference in this case relates to the second situation. It has been made by the Audiencia Nacional (the National High Court of Spain) in the course of proceedings between Google Spain SL and Google Inc. (individually or jointly ‘Google’) on the one side and the Agencia Española de Protección de Datos (‘the AEPD’) and Mr Mario Costeja González (‘the data subject’) on the other side. The proceedings concern the application of the Data Protection Directive to an internet search engine that Google operates as service provider. In the national proceedings it is undisputed that some personal data regarding the data subject have been published by a Spanish newspaper, in two of its printed issues in 1998, both of which were republished at a later date in its electronic version made available on the internet. The data subject now thinks that this information should no longer be displayed in the search results presented by the internet search engine operated by Google, when a search is made of his name and surnames.

6. The questions referred to the Court fall into three categories. (8) The first group of questions relates to territorial scope of application of EU data protection rules. The second group addresses the issues relating to the legal position of an internet search engine service provider (9) in the light of the Directive, especially in terms of its scope of application ratione materiae. Finally, the third question concerns the so-called right to be forgotten and the issue of whether data subjects can request that some or all search results concerning them are no longer accessible through search engine. All of these questions, which also raise important points of fundamental rights protection, are new to the Court.

7. This appears to be the first case in which the Court is called upon to interpret the Directive in the context internet search engines; an issue that is seemingly topical for national data protection authorities and Member State courts. Indeed, the referring court has indicated that it has several similar cases pending before it.

8. The most important previous case of this Court in which data protection issues and the internet have been addressed was Lindqvist (10). However, in that case internet search engines were not involved. The Directive itself has been interpreted in a number of cases. Of these Österreichischer Rundfunk (11), Satakunnan Markkinapörssi and Satamedia (12) and Volker und Markus Schecke and Eifert (13) are particularly relevant. The role of internet search engines in relation to intellectual property rights and jurisdiction of courts has also been addressed in the case-law of the Court in Google France and Google, Portakabin, L’Oréal and Others, Interflora and Interflora British Unit and Wintersteiger. (14)

9. Since the adoption of the Directive, a provision on protection of personal data has been included in Article 16 TFEU and in Article 8 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (‘the Charter’). Moreover, in 2012, the Commission made a Proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation,
with a view to replacing the Directive. However, the dispute to hand has to be decided on the basis of existing law.

10. The present preliminary reference is affected by the fact that when the Commission proposal for the Directive was made in 1990, the internet in the present sense of the World Wide Web, did not exist, and nor were there any search engines. At the time the Directive was adopted in 1995 the internet had barely begun and the first rudimentary search engines started to appear, but nobody could foresee how profoundly it would revolutionise the world. Nowadays almost anyone with a smartphone or a computer could be considered to be engaged in activities on the internet to which the Directive could potentially apply.

II – Legal framework

A – The Data Protection Directive

11. Article 1 of the Directive obliges Member States to protect the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural persons, and in particular their right to privacy with respect to the processing of personal data, in accordance with the provisions of the Directive.

12. Article 2 defines, inter alia, the notions of ‘personal data’ and ‘data subject’, ‘processing of personal data’, ‘controller’ and ‘third party’.

13. According to Article 3, the Directive is to apply to the processing of personal data wholly or partly by automatic means, and in certain situations to the processing otherwise than by automatic means.

14. Pursuant to Article 4(1), a Member State is to apply the national provisions it adopts pursuant to the Directive to the processing of personal data where there is an establishment of the controller on its territory, or in cases where the controller is not established in the Union, if he makes use of equipment situated on the territory of the Member State for the purposes of processing personal data.

15. Article 12 of the Directive provides data subjects ‘a right of access’ to personal data processed by the controller and Article 14 a ‘right to object’ to the processing of personal data in certain situations.

16. Article 29 of the Directive sets up an independent advisory working party consisting, among others, of data protection authorities of the Member States (‘the Article 29 Working Party’).

B – National law

17. Organic Law No 15/1999 on data protection has transposed the Directive in Spanish law. (16)

III – Facts and questions referred for a preliminary ruling

18. In early 1998, a newspaper widely circulated in Spain published in its printed edition two announcements concerning a real-estate auction connected with attachment proceedings prompted by social security debts. The data subject was mentioned as the owner. At a later date an electronic version of the newspaper was made available online by its publisher.

19. In November 2009, the data subject contacted the publisher of the newspaper asserting that, when his name and surnames were entered in the Google search engine, a reference appeared to pages of the newspaper with the announcements concerning the real-estate auction. He argued that the attachment proceedings relating to his social security debts had been concluded and resolved many years earlier and were now of no relevance. The publisher replied to him saying that erasure of his data was not appropriate, given that the publication was effected by order of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

20. In February 2010, the data subject contacted Google Spain and requested that the search results should not show any links to the newspaper when his name and surnames were entered in the Google search engine. Google Spain forwarded the request to Google Inc., whose registered office is in California, United States, taking the view that the latter was the undertaking providing the internet search service.

21. Thereafter the data subject lodged a complaint with the AEPD asking that the publisher be required to remove or rectify the publication so that his personal data did not appear or else should use the tools made available by search engines to protect his personal data. He also asserted that Google Spain or Google Inc. should be required to remove or conceal his data so that they ceased to be included in the search results and reveal links to the newspaper.

22. By a decision on 30 July 2010, the Director of the AEPD upheld the complaint made by the data subject against Google Spain and Google Inc., calling on them to take the measures necessary to withdraw the data from their index and to render future access to them impossible but rejected the complaint against the publisher. This was so because publication of the data in the press was legally justified. Google Spain and Google Inc. have brought two appeals before the referring court, seeking annulment of the AEPD decision.

23. The national court has stayed the proceedings and referred the following questions to the Court for a preliminary ruling:

1. With regard to the territorial application of [the Directive] and, consequently, of the Spanish data protection legislation:

1.1. must it be considered that an “establishment”, within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of [the Directive], exists when any one or more of the following circumstances arise:

– when the undertaking providing the search engine sets up in a Member State an office or subsidiary for the purpose of promoting and selling advertising space on the search engine, which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that State, or
– when the parent company designates a subsidiary located in that Member State as its representative and controller for two specific filing systems which relate to the data of customers who have contracted for advertising with that undertaking, or
– when the office or subsidiary established in a Member State forwards to the parent company, located outside the European Union, requests and
requirements addressed to it both by data subjects and by the authorities with responsibility for ensuring observation of the right to data protection, even where such collaboration is engaged in voluntarily?

1.2. Must Article 4(1)(c) of [the Directive] be interpreted as meaning that there is “use of equipment ... situated on the territory of that Member State” when a search engine uses crawlers or robots to locate and index information contained in web pages located on servers in that Member State or when it uses a domain name pertaining to a Member State and arranges for searches and the results thereof to be based on the language of that Member State?

1.3. Is it possible to regard as a use of equipment, in the terms of Article 4(1)(c) of [the Directive], the temporary storage of the information indexed by internet search engines? If the answer to that question is affirmative, can it be considered that that connecting factor is present when the undertaking refuses to disclose the place where it stores those indexes, invoking reasons of competition?

1.4. Regardless of the answers to the foregoing questions and particularly in the event that the [Court] considers that the connecting factors referred to in Article 4 of the Directive are not present: must [the Directive] be applied, in the light of Article 8 of the [Charter], in the Member State where the centre of gravity of the conflict is located and more effective protection of the rights of European Union citizens is possible?

2. As regards the activity of search engines as providers of content in relation to [the Directive]:

2.1. in relation to the activity of the search engine of the ‘Google’ undertaking on the internet, as a provider of content, consisting in locating information published or included on the net by third parties, indexing it automatically, storing it temporarily and finally making it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference, when that information contains personal data of third parties, must an activity like the one described be interpreted as falling within the concept of “processing of ... data” used in Article 2(b) of [the Directive]?

2.2. If the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative, and once again in relation to an activity like the one described: must Article 2(d) of the Directive be interpreted as meaning that the undertaking managing the “Google” search engine is to be regarded as the ‘controller’ of the personal data contained in the web pages that it indexes?

2.3. In the event that the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative, may the national data-control authority (in this case the [AEPD]), protecting the rights embodied in Articles 12(b) and 14(a) of [the Directive], directly impose on the search engine of the “Google” undertaking a requirement that it withdraw from its indexes an item of information published by third parties, without addressing itself in advance or simultaneously to the owner of the web page on which that information is located?

2.4. In the event that the answer to the foregoing question is affirmative, would the obligation of search engines to protect those rights be excluded when the information that contains the personal data has been lawfully published by third parties and is kept on the web page from which it originates?

3. Regarding the scope of the right of erasure and/or the right to object, in relation to the “derecho al olvido” (the “right to be forgotten”), the following question is asked:

3.1. must it be considered that the right to erasure and blocking of data, provided for in Article 12(b), and the right to object, provided for by Article 14(a), of [the Directive], extend to enabling the data subject to address himself to search engines in order to prevent indexing of the information relating to him personally, published on third parties’ web pages, invoking his wish that such information should not be known to internet users when he considers that it might be prejudicial to him or he wishes it to be consigned to oblivion, even though the information in question has been lawfully published by third parties?

24. Written observations were submitted by Google, the Governments of Spain, Greece, Italy, Austria and Poland, and European Commission. With the exception of the Polish Government, all of them attended the hearing on 26 February 2013, as did the representative of the data subject, and presented oral argument.

IV – Preliminary observations

A – Introductory remarks

25. The key issue in the present case is how the role of internet search engine service providers should be interpreted in the light of the existing EU legal instruments relating to data protection, and in particular the Directive. Therefore it is instructive to start with some observations relating to the development of data protection, the internet and internet search engines.

26. At the time when the Directive was negotiated and adopted in 1995 (17), it was given a wide scope of application ratione materiae. This was done in order to catch up with technological developments relating to data processing by controllers that was more decentralised than filing systems based on traditional centralised data banks, and which also covered new types of personal data like images and processing techniques such as free text searches. (18)

27. In 1995, generalised access to the internet was a new phenomenon. Today, after almost two decades, the amount of digitalised content available online has exploded. It can be easily accessed, consulted and disseminated through social media, as well as downloaded to various devices, such as tablet computers, smartphones and laptop computers. However, it is clear that the development of the internet into a comprehensive global stock of information which is universally accessible and searchable was not foreseen by the Community legislator.

28. At the heart of the present preliminary reference is the fact that the internet magnifies and facilitates in an unprecedented manner the dissemination of information. (19) Similarly, as the invention of printing in the 15th
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29. Due to these developments, the potential scope of application of the Directive in the modern world has become be surprisingly wide. Let us think of a European law professor who has downloaded, from the Court’s website, the essential case-law of the Court to his laptop computer. In terms of the Directive, the professor could be considered to be a ‘controller’ of personal data originating from a third party. The professor has files containing personal data that are processed automatically for search and consultation within the context of activities that are not purely personal or household related. In fact, anyone today reading a newspaper on a tablet computer or following social media on a smartphone appears to be engaged in processing of personal data with automatic means, and could potentially fall within the scope of application of the Directive to the extent this takes place outside his purely private capacity. (20) In addition, the wide interpretation given by the Court to the fundamental right to private life in a data protection context seems to expose any human communication by electronic means to the scrutiny by reference to this right.

30. In the current setting, the broad definitions of personal data, processing of personal data and controller are likely to cover an unprecedentedly wide range of new factual situations due to technological development. This is so because many, if not most, websites and files that are accessible through them include personal data, such as names of living natural persons. This obliges the Court to apply a rule of reason, in other words, the principle of proportionality, in interpreting the scope of the Directive in order to avoid unreasonable and excessive legal consequences. This moderate approach was applied by the Court already in Lindqvist, where it rejected an interpretation which could have lead to an unreasonably wide scope of application of Article 25 of the Directive on transfer of personal data to third countries in the context of the internet. (21)

31. Hence, in the present case it will be necessary to strike a correct, reasonable and proportionate balance between the protection of personal data, the coherent interpretation of the objectives of the information society and legitimate interests of economic operators and internet users at large. Albeit the Directive has not been amended since its adoption in 1995, its application to novel situations has been unavoidable. It is a complex area where law and new technology meet. The opinions adopted by the Article 29 Working Party provide very helpful analysis in this respect. (22)

B – Internet search engines and data protection
32. When analysing the legal position of an internet search engine in relation to the data protection rules, the following elements should be noted. (23)

33. First, in its basic form, an internet search engine does not in principle create new autonomous content. In its simplest form, it only indicates where already existing content, made available by third parties on the internet, can be found by giving a hyperlink to the website containing the search terms.

34. Second, the search results displayed by an internet search engine are not based on an instant search of the whole World Wide Web, but they are gathered from content that the internet search engine has previously processed. This means that the internet search engine has retrieved contents from existing websites and copied, analysed and indexed that content on its own devices. This retrieved content contains personal data if any of the source web pages do.

35. Third, to make the results more user-friendly, internet search engines often display additional content alongside the link to the original website. There can be text extracts, audiovisual content or even snapshots of the source web pages. This preview information can be at least in part retrieved from the devices of the internet search engine service provider, and not instantly from the original website. This means that the service provider actually holds the information so displayed.

C – Regulation of internet search engines
36. The European Union has attached great importance to the development of the information society. In this context, the role of information society intermediaries has also been addressed. Such intermediaries act as bridge builders between content providers and internet users. The specific role of intermediaries has been recognised, for example, in the Directive (recital 47 in the preamble thereto), in the ecommerce Directive 2000/31 (24) (Article 21(2) and recital 18 in the preamble thereto) as well as in Opinion 1/2008 of the Article 29 Working Party. The role of internet service providers has been considered as crucial for the information society, and their liability for the third-party content they transfer and/or store has been limited in order to facilitate their legitimate activities.

37. The role and legal position of internet search engine service providers has not been expressly regulated in EU legislation. As such ‘information location tool services’ are ‘provided at a distance, by electronic means and at the individual request of a recipient of services’, and amount thus to an information society service consisting of provision of tools that allow for search, access and retrieval of data. However, internet search engine service providers like Google who do not provide their service in return for remuneration from the internet users, appear to fall in that capacity outside the scope of application of ecommerce Directive 2000/31. (25)

38. Despite this, it is necessary to analyse their position vis-à-vis the legal principles underpinning the limitations on the liability of internet service providers. In other words, to what extent are activities performed
by an internet search engine service provider, from the point of view of liability principles, analogous to the services enumerated in the ecommerce Directive 2000/31 (transfer, mere caching, hosting) or transmission service mentioned in recital 47 in the preamble to the Directive, and to what extent does the internet search engine service provider act as content provider in its own right.

D – The role and liability of source web page publishers

39. The Court found in Lindqvist that ‘the operation of loading personal data on an internet page must be considered to be [processing of personal data]’. (26) Moreover, ‘placing information on an internet page entails, under current technical and computer procedures, the operation of loading that page onto a server and the operations necessary to make that page accessible to people who are connected to the internet. Such operations are performed, at least in part, automatically.’ The Court concluded that ‘the act of referring, on an internet page, to various persons and identifying them by name or by other means’ ‘constitutes “the processing of personal data” wholly or partly by automatic means within the meaning of Article 3(1) of [the Directive]’. (27)

40. It follows from the above findings in Lindqvist that the publisher of source web pages containing personal data is a controller of processing of personal data within the meaning of the Directive. As such the publisher is bound by all the obligations the Directive imposes on the controllers.

41. Source web pages are kept on host servers connected to internet. The publisher of source web pages can make use of ‘exclusion codes’ (27) for the operation of the internet search engines. Exclusion codes advise search engines not to index or to store a source web page or to display it within the search results. (28) Their use indicates that the publisher does not want certain information on the source web page to be retrieved for dissemination through search engines. (29)

42. Therefore, technically, the publisher has the possibility to include in his web pages exclusion codes restricting indexing and archiving of the page, and thereby enhancing the protection of personal data. In the extreme, the publisher can withdraw the page from the host server, republish it without the objectionable personal data, and require updating of the page in the cache memories of search engines.

43. Hence, the person who publishes the content on the source web page, is in his capacity of controller liable for the personal data published on the page, and that person has various means for fulfilling his obligations in this respect. This channelling of legal liability is in line with the established principles of publisher liability in the context of traditional media. (30)

44. This liability of publisher does not, however, guarantee that the data protection problems may be dealt with conclusively only by recourse to the controllers of the source web pages. As the referring court has pointed out, it is possible that the same personal data has been published on innumerable pages, which would make tracing and contacting all relevant publishers difficult or even impossible. Moreover, the publisher might reside in a third country, and the web pages concerned could fall outside the scope of application of EU data protection rules. There might also be legal impediments such as in the present case where the retaining of the original publication on the internet has been considered to be lawful.

45. In fact, universal accessibility of information on the internet relies on internet search engines, because finding relevant information without them would be too complicated and difficult, and would produce limited results. As the referring court rightly observes, acquiring information about announcements on the forced sale of the data subject’s property would previously have required a visit to the archives of the newspaper. Now this information can be acquired by typing his name into an internet search engine and this makes the dissemination of such data considerably more efficient, and at the same time, more disturbing for the data subject. Internet search engines may be used for extensive profiling of individuals by searching and collecting their personal data. Yet the fear relating to the profiling of individuals was the inspiration for the development of modern data protection legislation. (31)

46. For these reasons, it is important to examine the liability of internet search engine service providers in respect of personal data published on third-party source web pages which are accessible through their search engines. In other words, the Court is here faced with the issue of ‘secondary liability’ of this category of information society service providers analogous to that it has dealt with in its case-law on trademarks and electronic marketplaces. (32)

E – Activities of an internet search engine service provider

47. An internet search engine service provider may have various types of activities. The nature and assessment of those activities from the data protection point of view may be different.

48. An internet search engine service provider may automatically acquire personal data relating to its users, (32) that is, persons who enter search terms into the search engine. This automatically transmitted data can include their IP address, user preferences (language, etc.), and of course the search terms themselves which in the case of so-called vanity searches (that is, searches made by a user with his own name) easily reveal the identity of users. Moreover, as regards persons who have user accounts and who have thus registered themselves, their personal data such as names, e-mail addresses and telephone numbers, almost invariably end up in the hands of the internet search engine service provider.

49. The revenue of internet search engine service providers does not come from the users who enter the search terms in the search engine, but from the advertisers who buy search terms as keywords so that their advertisement is displayed simultaneously with the search results of using that keyword. (33) It is
obvious that personal data relating to advertising customers comes into the possession of the service provider. Google acting as a simple internet search engine service provider in relation to data, including personal data, published on the internet in third-party source web pages and processed and indexed by Google’s search engine. Hence, the problems of the users and advertising customers, to whose data the Directive is undoubtedly applicable with respect to their relationship with Google, do not affect the analysis of the second group of preliminary questions. However, concerning the jurisdictional issues under the first group of preliminary questions these customer groups may be relevant. V – First group of questions relating to territorial scope of application of the Directive

A – Introduction

51. The first group of preliminary questions concerns the interpretation of Article 4 of the Directive, as regards the criteria determining the territorial scope of application of the national implementing legislation. 52. The referring court has divided its preliminary questions with regard to the territorial application of the Spanish data protection legislation into four sub-questions. The first sub-question relates to the concept of an ‘establishment’, within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of the Directive and the second to the circumstances where there is ‘use of equipment ... situated on the territory of that Member State’ within the meaning of Article 4(1)(c) thereof. The third sub-question asks if it is possible to regard, as use of equipment, the temporary storage of the information indexed by internet search engines, and if the answer to that question is affirmative, whether the presence of this connecting factor may be presumed where the undertaking refuses to disclose the place where it stores those indexes. The fourth sub-question asks whether the legislation implementing the Directive must be applied, in the light of Article 8 of the Charter, in the Member State where the centre of gravity of the dispute is situated and where more effective protection of the rights of European Union citizens is possible. 53. I shall first address the last sub-question, which the national court has posed ‘regardless of the answers to the foregoing questions and particularly in the event that [the Court] considers that the connecting factors referred to in Article 4(1) of the Directive are not present’. B – The geographical centre of gravity of the dispute in itself is not sufficient to render the Directive applicable

54. According to Article 51(2) thereof, the Charter does not extend the field of application of European Union law beyond the powers of the Union or establish any new power or task for the Union, or modify powers and tasks as defined in the Treaties. (34) This principle also applies to Article 8 of the Charter on protection of personal data. Hence, the interpretation of the Directive in accordance with the Charter cannot add any new elements that might give rise to the territorial applicability of the national legislation implementing the Directive to those laid down in Article 4(1) of the Directive. 55. The Article 29 Working Party rightly emphasised that the territorial scope of application of the Directive and the national implementing legislation is triggered either by the location of the establishment of the controller, or the location of the means or equipment being used when the controller is established outside the EEA. Nationality or place of habitual residence of data subjects is not decisive, nor is the physical location of the personal data. (36) 56. The Article 29 Working Party has proposed that in future legislation relevant targeting of individuals could be taken into account in relation to controllers not established in the EU. (37) In the Commission Proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation (2012) (38) the offering of goods or services to data subjects residing in the European Union would be a factor making EU data protection law applicable to third country controllers. Such an approach, attaching the territorial applicability of EU legislation to the targeted public, is consistent with the Court’s case-law on the applicability of the e-commerce Directive 2000/31, (39) Regulation No 44/2001, (40) and Directive 2001/29 (41) to cross-border situations. 57. By contrast, the criterion of a targeted public, in the present case Spanish users of Google’s internet search engine, in whose eyes the data subject’s reputation may have been harmed as a result of the disputed announcements, does not seem to be a factor triggering the territorial applicability of the Directive and its national implementation legislation. 58. Therefore, the centre of gravity of the dispute in Spain cannot be added to the criteria set out in Article 4(1) of the Directive which, in my opinion, fully harmonises the territorial scope of application of Member States’ data protection laws. This applies irrespective of whether such a centre of gravity is the nationality or residence of the data subject concerned, the location of the disputed personal data in the newspaper’s website, or the fact that Google’s Spanish website especially targeted the Spanish public. (42) 59. For these reasons I propose that, if the Court finds it necessary to answer that question, it should answer the fourth sub-question in the negative. C – The applicability of the criterion of ‘establishment in the EU’ to a third country internet search engine service provider

60. According to Article 4(1) of the Directive, the primary factor that gives rise to the territorial applicability of the national data protection legislation is the processing of personal data carried out in the context of the activities of an establishment of the controller on the territory of the Member State. Further,
when a controller is not established on EU territory but uses means or equipment (43) situated on the territory of the Member State for processing of personal data, the legislation of that Member State applies unless such equipment or means is used only for purposes of transit through the territory of the EU.

61. As noted above, the Directive and Article 4 thereof were adopted before the large-scale provision of online services on the internet started. Moreover, in this respect, its wording is not consistent and is incomplete. (44) It is no wonder that data protection experts have had considerable difficulties in interpreting it in relation to the internet. The facts of the present case illustrate these problems.

62. Google Inc. is a Californian firm with subsidiaries in various EU Member States. Its European operations are to a certain extent coordinated by its Irish subsidiary. It currently has data centres at least in Belgium and Finland. Information on the exact geographical location of the functions relating to its search engine is not made public. Google claims that no processing of personal data relating to its search engine takes place in Spain. Google Spain acts as commercial representative of Google for its advertising functions. In this capacity it has taken responsibility for the processing of personal data relating to its Spanish advertising customers. Google denies that its search engine performs any operations on the host servers of the source web pages, or that it collects information by means of cookies of non registered users of its search engine.

63. In this factual context the wording of Article 4(1) of the Directive is not very helpful. Google has several establishments on EU territory. This fact would, according to a literal interpretation, exclude the applicability of the equipment condition laid down in Article 4(1)(c) of the Directive. On the other hand, it is not clear to what extent and where processing of personal data of EU resident data subjects takes place in the context of its EU subsidiaries.

64. In my opinion the Court should approach the question of territorial applicability from the perspective of the business model of internet search engine service providers. This, as I have mentioned, normally relies on keyword advertising which is the source of income and, as such, the economic raison d’être for the provision of a free information location tool in the form of a search engine. The entity in charge of keyword advertising is called ‘referencing service provider’ in the Court’s case-law (45) is linked to the internet search engine. This entity needs presence on national advertising markets. For this reason Google has established subsidiaries in many Member States which clearly constitute establishments within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of the Directive. It also provides national web domains such as google.es or google.fi. The activity of the search engine takes this national diversification into account in various ways relating to the display of the search results because the normal financing model of keyword advertising follows the pay-per-click principle. (46)

65. For these reasons I would adhere to the Article 29 Working Party’s conclusion to the effect that the business model of an internet search engine service provider must be taken into account in the sense that its establishment plays a relevant role in the processing of personal data if it is linked to a service involved in selling targeted advertisement to inhabitants of that Member State. (47)

66. Moreover, even if Article 4 of the Directive is based on a single concept of controller as regards its substantive provisions, I think that for the purposes of deciding on the preliminary issue of territorial applicability, an economic operator must be considered as a single unit, and thus, at this stage of analysis, not be dissected on the basis of its individual activities relating to processing of personal data or different groups of data subjects to which its activities relate.

67. In conclusion, processing of personal data takes place within the context of a controller’s establishment if that establishment acts as the bridge for the referencing service to the advertising market of that Member State, even if the technical data processing operations are situated in other Member States or third countries.

68. For this reason, I propose that the Court should answer the first group of preliminary questions in the sense that processing of personal data is carried out in the context of the activities of an ‘establishment’ of the controller within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of the Directive when the undertaking providing the search engine sets up in a Member State for the purpose of promoting and selling advertising space on the search engine, an office or subsidiary which orients its activity towards the inhabitants of that State.

VI – Second group of questions relating to scope of application ratione materiae of the Directive

69. The second group of questions pertains to the legal position of an internet search engine service provider offering access to an internet search engine in the light of the provisions of the Directive. The national court has formulated them as concerning the notions of ‘processing’ of personal data (question 2.1), and ‘controller’ (question 2.2.), the competences of the national data protection authority to give orders directly to the internet search engine service provider (question 2.3) and the possible exclusion of protection of personal data by the internet search engine service provider concerning information lawfully published by third parties on the internet (question 2.4). These last two sub-questions are relevant only if the internet search engine service provider can be considered as processing personal data on third-party source web pages and as being the controller thereof.

A – Processing of personal data by an internet search engine

70. The first sub-question in this group concerns the applicability of the notions of ‘personal data’ and ‘processing’ thereof to a internet search engine service provider such as Google, on the assumption that we are not discussing personal data of users or advertisers, but personal data published on third-party source web
75. It goes without saying that the operations described in the previous paragraphs count as ‘processing’ of the personal data on the source web pages copied, indexed, cached and displayed by the search engine. More particularly they entail collection, recording, organisation and storage of such personal data and they may entail their use, disclosure by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available and combining of personal data in the sense of Article 2(b) of the Directive.

B – The concept of ‘controller’

76. A controller (55) is according to Article 2(d) of the Directive ‘the natural or legal person … which alone or jointly with others determines the purposes and means of the processing of personal data’. In my opinion the core issue in this case is whether, and to what extent, an internet search engine service provider is covered by this definition.

77. All parties except for Google and the Greek Government propose an affirmative answer to this question, which might easily be defended as a logical conclusion of a literal and perhaps even teleological interpretation of the Directive, given that the basic definitions of the Directive were formulated in a comprehensive manner in order to cover new developments. In my opinion such an approach would, however, represent a method that completely ignores the fact that when the Directive was drafted it was not possible to take into account the emergence of the internet and the various related new phenomena.

78. When the Directive was adopted the World Wide Web had barely become a reality, and search engines were at their nascent stage. The provisions of the Directive simply do not take into account the fact that enormous masses of decentrally hosted electronic documents and files are accessible from anywhere on the globe and that their contents can be copied and analysed and disseminated by parties having no relation whatsoever to their authors or those who have uploaded them onto a host server connected to the internet.

79. I recall that in Lindqvist the Court did not follow the maximalist approach proposed by the Commission in relation to the interpretation of the notion of transfer of data to third countries. The Court stated that '[given], first, the state of development of the internet at the time [the Directive] was drawn up and, second, the absence, in Chapter IV, of criteria applicable to the use of internet, one cannot presume that the Community legislature intended the expression “transfer of data” to a third country” to cover the loading, by an individual in Mrs Lindqvist’s position, of data onto an internet page, even if those data are thereby made accessible to persons in third countries with the technical means to access them’. (56) In my opinion this implies that in the interpretation of the Directive, vis-à-vis new technological phenomena, the principle of proportionality, the objectives of the Directive and means provided therein for their attainment must be taken into account in order to achieve a balanced and reasonable outcome.
80. To my mind, one key question here is whether it matters that within the definition of controller the Directive refers to the controller as the person ‘determining the purposes and means of the processing of the personal data’ (emphasis added). The parties who consider Google to be a controller base this assessment on the undeniable fact that the service provider running an internet search engine determines the purposes and means of the processing of data for his purposes.

81. I doubt, however, whether this leads to a truthful construction of the Directive in a situation where the object of processing consists of files containing personal data and other data in a haphazard, indiscriminate and random manner. Does the European law professor mentioned in my example in paragraph 29 above determine the purposes and means of the processing of personal data included in the Court’s judgments he has downloaded to his laptop? The finding of the Article 29 Working Party according to which 'users of the search engine service could strictly speaking also be considered as controllers’ reveals the irrational nature of the blind literal interpretation of the Directive in the context of the internet. (57) The Court should not accept an interpretation which makes a controller of processing of personal data published on the internet of virtually everybody owning a smartphone or a tablet or a laptop computer.

82. In my opinion the general scheme of the Directive, most language versions and the individual obligations it imposes on the controller are based on the idea of responsibility of the controller over the personal data processed in the sense that the controller is aware of the existence of a certain defined category of information amounting to personal data and the controller processes this data with some intention which relates to their processing as personal data. (58)

83. The Article 29 Working Party correctly notes that ‘[t]he concept of controller is a functional concept, intended to allocate responsibilities where the factual influence is, and thus based on a factual rather than a formal analysis’. (59) It continues that ‘the controller must determine which data shall be processed for the purpose(s) envisaged’. (60) The substantive provisions of the Directive, and more particularly Articles 6, 7 and 8 thereof, are, in my opinion, based on the assumption that the controller knows what he is doing in relation to the personal data concerned, in the sense that he is aware of what kind of personal data he is processing and why. In other words, the data processing must appear to him as processing of personal data, that is ‘information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person’ in some semantically relevant way and not a mere computer code. (61)

C – An internet search engine service provider is not a ‘controller’ of personal data on third-party source web pages

84. The internet search engine service provider merely supplying an information location tool does not exercise control over personal data included on third-party web pages. The service provider is not ‘aware’ of the existence of personal data in any other sense than as a statistical fact web pages are likely to include personal data. In the course of processing of the source web pages for the purposes of crawling, analysing and indexing, personal data does not manifest itself as such in any particular way.

85. It is for this reason that I find the approach of the Article 29 Working Party adequate as it seeks to draw a line between the entirely passive and intermediary functions of search engines and situations where their activity represents real control over the personal data processed. (62) For the sake of completeness, it needs to be added that issue of whether the personal data has become public (63) or has been disclosed legally on third-party source web pages is not relevant for application of the Directive. (64)

86. The internet search engine service provider has no relationship with the content of third-party source web pages on the internet where personal data may appear. Moreover, as the search engine works on the basis of copies of the source web pages that its crawler function has retrieved and copied, the service provider does not have any means of changing the information in the host servers. Provision of an information location tool does not imply any control over the content. It does not even enable the internet search engine service provider to distinguish between personal data, in the sense of the Directive, that relates to an identifiable living natural person, and other data.

87. Here I would draw from the principle expressed in recital 47 in the preamble to the Directive. It states that the controller of messages containing personal data transmitted by telecommunication or by electronic mail is the originator of the message and not the person offering transmission services. This recital, as well as the exceptions to liability provided in the e-commerce Directive 2000/31 (Articles 12, 13 and 14), builds on the legal principle according to which automated, technical and passive relationships to electronically stored or transmitted content do not create control or liability over it.

88. The Article 29 Working Party has emphasised that, first and foremost, the purpose of the concept of controller is to determine who is to be responsible for compliance with data protection rules and to allocate this responsibility to the locus of the factual influence. (65) According to the Working Party, ‘[t]he principle of proportionality requires that to the extent that a search engine provider acts purely as an intermediary, it should not be considered as the principal controller with regard to the content related processing of personal data that is taking place. In this case the principal controllers of personal data are the information providers.’ (66)

89. In my view the internet search engine service provider cannot in law or in fact fulfil the obligations of controller provided in Articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Directive in relation to the personal data on source web pages hosted on third-party servers. Therefore a reasonable interpretation of the Directive requires that
the service provider is not generally considered as having that position. (67)

90. An opposite opinion would entail internet search engines being incompatible with EU law, a conclusion I would find absurd. Specifically, if internet search engine service providers were considered as controllers of the personal data on third-party source web pages and if on any of these pages there would be 'special categories of data' referred to in Article 8 of the Directive (e.g. personal data revealing political opinions or religious beliefs or data concerning the health or sex life of individuals), the activity of the internet search engine service provider would automatically become illegal, when the stringent conditions laid down in that article for the processing of such data were not met.

D – Circumstances in which the internet search engine service provider is a ‘controller’

91. Internet search engine service provider clearly controls the index of the search engine which links key words to the relevant URL addresses. The service provider determines how the index is structured, and it may technically block certain search results, for example by not displaying URL addresses from certain countries or domains within the search results. (68) Moreover, the internet search engine service provider controls its index in the sense that he decides whether exclusion codes (69) on source web page are to be complied with or not.

92. In contrast, the contents of the cache memory of the internet search engine cannot be considered as falling within the control of the service provider because the cache is the result of completely technical and automated processes producing a mirror image of the text data of the crawled web pages, with the exception of data excluded from indexing and archiving. It is of interest that some Member States seem to provide special horizontal exceptions regarding the liability of search engines analogous to the exception provided in ecommerce Directive 2000/31 for certain information society service providers. (70)

93. However, with regard to the contents of cache, a decision not to comply with the exclusion codes (71) on a web page entails in my opinion control in the sense of the Directive over such personal data. The same applies in situations where the internet search engine service provider does not update a web page in its cache despite a request received from the website.

E – The obligations of an internet search engine service provider as ‘controller’

94. It is obvious that if and when the internet search engine service provider can be considered as ‘controller’ he must comply with the obligations provided by the Directive.

95. As to the criteria relating making data processing legitimate in the absence of a data subject’s consent (Article 7(a) of the Directive), it seems obvious that provision of internet search engine services pursues as such legitimate interests (Article 7(f) of the Directive), namely (i) making information more easily accessible for internet users; (ii) rendering dissemination of the information uploaded on the internet more effective; and (iii) enabling various information society services supplied by the internet search engine service provider that are ancillary to the search engine, such as the provision of keyword advertising. These three purposes relate respectively to three fundamentals rights protected by the Charter, namely freedom of information and freedom of expression (both in Article 11) and freedom to conduct a business (Article 16). Hence, an internet search engine service provider pursues legitimate interests, within the meaning of Article 7(f) of the Directive, when he processes data made available on the internet, including personal data.

96. As controller, an internet search engine service provider must respect the requirements laid down in Article 6 of the Directive. In particular, the personal data must be adequate, relevant, and not excessive in relation to the purposes for which they are collected, and up to date, but not out dated for the purposes for which they were collected. Moreover, the interests of the ‘controller’, or third parties in whose interest the processing in exercised, and those of the data subject, must be weighed.

97. In the main proceedings, the data subject’s claim seeks to remove from Google’s index the indexing of his name and surnames with the URL addresses of the newspaper pages displaying the personal data he is seeking to suppress. Indeed, names of persons are used as search terms, and they are recorded as keywords in search engines’ indexes. Yet, usually a name does not as such suffice for direct identification of a natural person on the internet because globally there are several, even thousands or millions of persons with the same name or combination of a given name(s) and surname. (72) Nevertheless, I assume that in most cases combining a given name and surname as a search term enables the indirect identification of a natural person in the sense of Article 2(a) of the Directive as the search result in a search engine’s index reveals a limited set of links permitting the internet user to distinguish between persons with the same name.

98. A search engine’s index attaches names and other identifiers used as a search term to one or several links to web pages. Inasmuch as the link is adequate in the sense that the data corresponding to the search term really appears or has appeared on the linked web pages, the index in my opinion complies with the criteria of adequacy, relevancy, proportionality, accuracy and completeness, set out in Articles 6(c) and 6(d) of the Directive. As to the temporal aspects referred to in Articles 6(d) and 6(e) (personal data being up to date and personal data not being stored longer than necessary), these issues should also be addressed from the point of view of the processing in question, that is provision of information location service, and not as an issue relating to the content of the source web pages. (73)

F – Conclusion on the second group of questions

99. On the basis of this reasoning, I take the view that a national data protection authority cannot require an internet search engine service provider to withdraw
information from its index except for the cases where this service provider has not complied with the exclusion codes (74) or where a request emanating from the website regarding update of cache memory has not been complied with. This scenario does not seem pertinent for the present preliminary reference. A possible ‘notice and take down procedure’ (75) concerning links to source web pages with illegal or inappropriate contents is a matter of national law civil liability based on grounds other than the protection of personal data. (76)

100. For these reasons I propose that the Court answers the second group of questions in the sense that under the circumstances specified in the preliminary reference an internet search engine service provider ‘processes’ personal data in the sense of Article 2(b) of the Directive. However, the service provider cannot be considered as ‘controller’ of the processing of such personal data in the sense of Article 2(d) of the Directive with the exception explained above.

VII – Third question relating to the data subject’s possible ‘right to be forgotten’

A – Preliminary observations

101. The third preliminary question is only relevant if the Court either rejects the conclusion I have reached above to the effect that Google is not generally to be considered as having such a position. Otherwise, the section that follows is redundant.

102. In any event, by its third question the national court asks whether the rights to erasure and blocking of data, provided for in Article 12(b) of the Directive, and the right to object, provided for in Article 14(a) of the Directive, extend to enabling the data subject to contact the internet search engine service providers himself in order to prevent indexing of the information relating to him personally that has been published on third parties’ web pages. By so doing, a data subject seeks to prevent potentially prejudicial information from being known to internet users, or is expressing a desire for the information to be consigned to oblivion, even though the information in question has been lawfully published by third parties. In other words the national court asks in substance whether a ‘right to be forgotten’ can be founded on Article 12(b) and 14(a) of the Directive. This is the first issue to be addressed in the analysis that follows, which will be based on the wording and objectives of those provisions.

103. If I conclude that Articles 12(b) and 14(a) of the Directive, in and of themselves, do not afford this protection, I will then consider whether such an interpretation is compatible with the Charter. (77) This will require consideration of the right to protection of personal data in Article 8, right to respect for private and family life in Article 7, freedom of expression and information as protected in Article 11 (and both with respect to the freedom of expression of publishers of web pages and the freedom of internet users to receive information), and the freedom to conduct a business in Article 16. Indeed, the rights of data subjects in Articles 7 and 8 will need to be juxtaposed against the rights protected by Articles 11 and 16 of those who wish to disseminate or access the data.

B – Do the rights to rectification, erasure, blocking and objection provided in the Directive amount to a data subject’s right ‘to be forgotten’?

104. The rights to rectification, erasure and blocking of data provided in Article 12(b) of the Directive concern data, the processing of which does not comply with the provisions of the Directive, in particular because of the incomplete or inaccurate nature of the data (my emphasis).

105. The order for reference recognises that the information appearing on the web pages concerned cannot be regarded as incomplete or inaccurate. Even less is it claimed that Google’s index or the contents of its cache containing such data may be so described. Therefore, the right to rectification, erasure or blocking, referred to in Article 12(b) of the Directive, will only arise if Google’s processing of personal data from third-party source web pages is incompatible with the Directive for other reasons.

106. Article 14(a) of the Directive obliges Member States to grant a data subject the right to object at any time, on compelling legitimate grounds relating to his particular situation, to the processing of data relating to him, save where otherwise provided by national legislation. This applies especially in cases referred to in Articles 7(e) and 7(f) of the Directive, that is where processing is necessary in view of a public interest or for the purposes of the legitimate interests pursued by the controller or by third parties. Furthermore, according to Article 14(a), ‘the processing instigated by the controller’ may no longer involve the objected data if the objection is justified.

107. In the situations where internet search engine service providers are considered to be controllers of the processing of personal data, Article 6(2) of the Directive obliges them to weigh the interests of the data controller, or third parties in whose interest the processing is exercised, against those of the data subject. As the Court observed in ASNEF and FECEMD, whether or not the data in question already appears in public sources is relevant to this balancing exercise. (78)

108. However, as almost all of the parties having presented written observations in this case have asserted, I consider that the Directive does not provide for a general right to be forgotten in the sense that a data subject is entitled to restrict or terminate dissemination of personal data that he considers to be harmful or contrary to his interests. The purpose of processing and the interests served by it, when compared to those of the data subject, are the criteria to be applied when data is processed without the subject’s consent, and not the subjective preferences of the latter. A subjective preference alone does not amount to a compelling legitimate ground within the meaning of Article 14(a) of the Directive.
109. Even if the Court were to find that internet search engine service providers were responsible as controllers, quod non, for personal data on third-party source web pages, a data subject would still not have an absolute ‘right to be forgotten’ which could be relied on against these service providers. However, the service provider would need to put itself in the position of the publisher of the source web page and verify whether dissemination of the personal web page can at present be considered as legal and legitimate for the purposes of the Directive. In other words, the service provider would need to abandon its intermediary function between the user and the publisher and assume responsibility for the content of the source web page, and when needed, to censure the content by preventing or limiting access to it.

110. For the sake of completeness it is useful to recall that the Commission Proposal for a General Data Protection Regulation provides in its Article 17 for a right to be forgotten. However, the proposal seems have met with considerable opposition, and it does not purport to represent a codification of existing law, but an important legal innovation. Therefore it does not seem affect the answer to be given to the preliminary question. It is of interest, however, that according to Article 17(2) of the proposal ‘where the controller ... has made the personal data public, it shall take all reasonable steps ... in relation to data for the publication of which the controller is responsible, to inform third parties which are processing such data, that a data subject requests them to erase any links to, or copy or replication of that personal data’. This text seems to consider internet search engine service providers more as third parties than as controllers in their own right.

111. I therefore conclude that Articles 12(b) and 14(a) of the Directive do not provide for a right to be forgotten. I will now consider whether this interpretation of these provisions complies with the Charter.

C – The fundamental rights in issue

112. Article 8 of the Charter guarantees everyone the right to the protection of his personal data. Such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned, or some other legitimate basis laid down by law. Everyone has the right of access to data which has been collected concerning him, and the right to have it rectified. Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority.

113. In my opinion this fundamental right, being a restatement of the European Union and Council of Europe acquis in this field, emphasises the importance of protection of personal data, but it does not as such add any significant new elements to the interpretation of the Directive.

114. According to Article 7 of the Charter, everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications. This provision, being in substance identical to Article 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, signed in Rome on 4 November 1950 (ECHR), must be duly taken into account in the interpretation of the relevant provisions of the Directive, which requires the Member States to protect in particular the right to privacy.

115. I would recall that in the context of the ECHR, Article 8 thereof also covers issues relating to protection of personal data. For this reason, and in conformity with Article 52(3) of the Charter, the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights on Article 8 ECHR is relevant both to the interpretation of Article 7 of the Charter and to the application of the Directive in conformity with Article 8 of the Charter.

116. The European Court of Human Rights concluded in Niemietz that professional and business activities of an individual may fall within the scope of private life as protected under Article 8 ECHR. (79) This approach has been applied in subsequent case-law of that court.

117. Moreover, this Court found in Volker und Markus Schecke and Eifert (80) that ‘the right to respect for private life with regard to the processing of personal data, recognised by Articles 7 and 8 of the Charter, concerns any information [my emphasis] relating to an identified or identifiable individual ... and the limitations which may lawfully be imposed on the right to protection of personal data correspond to those tolerated in relation to Article 8 [ECHR]’.

118. I conclude on the basis of Volker und Markus Schecke and Eifert that the protection of private life under the Charter, with regard to the processing of personal data, covers all information relating to an individual irrespective of whether he acts in a purely private sphere or as an economic operator or, for example, as a politician. In view of the the wide notions of personal data and its processing in EU law, it seems to follow from abovementioned case-law that any act of communication relying on automatic means such as by means of telecommunications, e-mail or social media concerning a natural person constitutes as such a putative interference of that fundamental right that requires justification. (81)

119. I have concluded in paragraph 75 that an internet search engine service provider is engaged in processing of personal data displayed on third-party source web pages. Hence it follows from the Court’s judgment in Volker und Markus Schecke and Eifert that, independently of how his role is classified under the Directive, there is interference with the Article 7 Charter right to privacy of the concerned data subjects. According to the ECHR and the Charter any interference to protected rights must be based on law and be necessary in a democratic society. In the present case we are not faced with interference by public authorities in need of justification but of the question of the extent that interference by private subjects can be tolerated. The limits to this are set out in the Directive, and they are thus based on law, as required by the ECHR and the Charter. Hence, when the Directive is interpreted, the exercise precisely concerns the interpretation of the limits set to data processing by private subjects in light of the Charter. From this
follows the question of whether there is a positive obligation on the EU and the Member States to enforce, as against internet search engine service providers, which are private subjects, a right to be forgotten. (82) This in turn leads to questions of justification for interference in Article 7 and 8 of the Charter, and the relationship with the competing rights of freedom of expression and information, and the right to conduct a business.

D – Rights of freedom of expression and information, and the right to conduct a business

120. The present case concerns, from many angles, freedom of expression and information enshrined in Article 11 of the Charter, which corresponds to Article 10 ECHR. Article 11(1) of the Charter states that ‘[e]veryone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.’ (83)

121. The internet users’ right to seek and receive information made available on the internet is protected by Article 11 of the Charter. (84) This concerns both information on the source web pages and the information provided by internet search engines. As I have already mentioned, the internet has revolutionised access to and dissemination of all kinds of information and enabled new forms of communication and social interaction between individuals. In my opinion the fundamental right to information merits particular protection in EU law, especially in view of the ever-growing tendency of authoritarian regimes elsewhere to limit access to the internet or to censure content made accessible by it. (85)

122. Publishers of web pages equally enjoy protection under Article 11 of the Charter. Making content available on the internet counts as such as use of freedom of expression, (86) even more so when the publisher has linked his page to other pages and has not limited its indexing or archiving by search engines, thereby indicating his wish for wide dissemination of content. Web publication is a means for individuals to participate in debate or disseminate their own content or content uploaded by others on internet. (87)

123. In particular, the present preliminary reference concerns personal data published in the historical archives of a newspaper. In Times Newspapers Ltd v. the United Kingdom (nos. 1 and 2), the European Court of Human Rights observed that internet archives make a substantial contribution to preserving and making available news and information: ‘Such archives constitute an important source for education and historical research, particularly as they are readily accessible to the public and are generally free. ... However, the margin of appreciation afforded to States in striking the balance between the competing rights is likely to be greater where news archives of past events, rather than news reporting of current affairs, are concerned. In particular, the duty of the press to act in accordance with the principles of responsible journalism by ensuring accuracy [my emphasis] of historical, rather than perishable, information published is likely to be more stringent in the absence of any urgency in publishing the material.’ (88)

124. Commercial internet search engine service providers offer their information location services in the context of business activity aiming at revenue from keyword advertising. This makes it a business, the freedom of which is recognised under Article 16 of the Charter in accordance with EU law and national law. (89)

125. Moreover, it needs to be recalled that none of the fundamental rights at stake in this case are absolute. They may be limited provided that there is a justification acceptable in view of the conditions set out in Article 52(1) of the Charter. (90)

E – Can a data subject’s ‘right to be forgotten’ be derived from Article 7 of the Charter?

126. Finally, it is necessary to ponder whether interpretation of Articles 12(b) and 14(a) of the Directive in light of the Charter, and more particularly of Article 7 thereof, could lead to the recognition of a ‘right to be forgotten’ in the sense referred to by the national court. At the outset such a finding would not be against Article 51(2) of the Charter because it would concern precision of the scope of the data subject’s right of access and right to object already recognised by the Directive, not the creation of new rights or widening the scope of EU law.

127. The European Court of Human Rights held in the Aleksey Ovchinnikov case (91) that ‘in certain circumstances a restriction on reproducing information that has already entered the public domain may be justified, for example to prevent further airing of the details of an individual’s private life which do not come within the scope of any political or public debate on a matter of general importance’. The fundamental right to protection of private life can thus in principle be invoked even if the information concerned is already in the public domain.

128. However, a data subject’s right to protection of his private life must be balanced with other fundamental rights, especially with freedom of expression and freedom of information.

129. A newspaper publisher’s freedom of information protects its right to digitally republish its printed newspapers on the internet. In my opinion the authorities, including data protection authorities, cannot censure such republishing. The Times Newspapers Ltd v. the United Kingdom (nos. 1 and 2) judgment of the European Court of Human Rights (92) demonstrates that the liability of the publisher regarding accuracy of historical publications may be more stringent than those of current news, and may require the use of appropriate caveats supplementing the contested content. However, in my opinion there could be no justification for requiring digital republishing of an issue of a newspaper with content different from the originally published printed version. That would amount to falsification of history.
130. The data protection problem at the heart of the present litigation only appears if an internet user types the data subject’s name and surnames into the search engine, thereby being given a link to the newspaper’s web pages with the contested announcements. In such a situation the internet user is actively using his right to receive information concerning the data subject from public sources for reasons known only to him. (93)

131. In contemporary information society, the right to search information published on the internet by means of search engines is one of the most important ways to exercise that fundamental right. This right undoubtedly covers the right to seek information relating to other individuals that is, in principle, protected by the right to private life such as information on the internet relating to an individual’s activities as a businessman or politician. An internet user’s right to information would be compromised if his search for information concerning an individual did not generate search results providing a truthful reflection of the relevant web pages but a “bowdlerised” (94) version thereof.

132. An internet search engine service provider lawfully exercises both his freedom to conduct business and freedom of expression when he makes available internet information location tools relying on a search engine.

133. The particularly complex and difficult constellation of fundamental rights that this case presents prevents justification for reinforcing the data subjects’ legal position under the Directive, and imbuing it with a right to be forgotten. This would entail sacrificing pivotal rights such as freedom of expression and information. I would also discourage the Court from concluding that these conflicting interests could satisfactorily be balanced in individual cases on a case-by-case basis, with the judgment to be left to the internet search engine service provider. Such ‘notice and take down procedures’, if required by the Court, are likely either to lead to the automatic withdrawal of links to any objected contents or to an unmanageable number of requests handled by the most popular and important internet search engine service providers. (95) In this context it is necessary to recall that ‘notice and take down procedures’ that appear in the ecommerce Directive 2000/31 relate to unlawful content, but in the context of the case at hand we are faced with a request for suppressing legitimate and legal information that has entered the public sphere.

134. In particular, internet search engine service providers should not be saddled with such an obligation. This would entail an interference with the freedom of expression of the publisher of the web page, who would not enjoy adequate legal protection in such a situation, any unregulated ‘notice and take down procedure’ being a private matter between the data subject and the search engine service provider. (96) It would amount to the censuring of his published content by a private party. (97) It is a completely different thing that the States have positive obligations to provide an effective remedy against the publisher infringing the right to private life, which in the context of internet would concern the publisher of the web page.

135. As the Article 29 Working Party has observed, it is possible that the secondary liability of the search engine service providers under national law may lead to duties amounting to blocking access to third-party websites with illegal contents such as web pages infringing IP rights, or displaying libellous or criminal information. (98)

136. In contrast any generalised right to be forgotten cannot be invoked against them on the basis of the Directive even when it is interpreted in harmony with the Charter.

137. For these reasons I propose that the Court should answer the third preliminary question to the effect that the rights to erasure and blocking of data, provided for in Article 12(b), and the right to object, provided for by Article 14(a), of the Directive, do not extend to such a right to be forgotten as described in the preliminary reference.

VIII – Conclusion

138. In the light of the above considerations, I am of the opinion that the Court should reply as follows to the questions referred by the Audiencia Nacional:

(1) Processing of personal data is carried out in the context of the activities of an ‘establishment’ of the controller within the meaning of Article 4(1)(a) of Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data when the undertaking providing the internet search engine sets up in a Member State, for the purposes of promoting and selling advertising space on the search engine, an office or subsidiary which orientates its activity towards the inhabitants of that State.

(2) An internet search engine service provider, whose search engine locates information published or included on the internet by third parties, indexes it automatically, stores it temporarily and finally makes it available to internet users according to a particular order of preference, ‘processes’ personal data in the sense of Article 2(b) of Directive 95/46 when that information contains personal data.

However, the internet search engine service provider cannot be considered as ‘controller’ of the processing of such personal data in the sense of Article 2(d) of Directive 95/46, with the exception of the contents of the index of its search engine, provided that the service provider does not index or archive personal data against the instructions or requests of the publisher of the web page.

(3) The rights to erasure and blocking of data, provided for in Article 12(b), and the right to object, provided for in Article 14(a), of Directive 95/46, do not confer on the data subject a right to address himself to a search engine service provider in order to prevent indexing of the information relating to him personally, published legally on third parties’ web pages, invoking his wish that such information should not be known to internet
users when he considers that it might be prejudicial to him or he wishes it to be consigned to oblivion.

1 – Original language: English.
3 – In actual fact the ‘internet’ comprises two main services, namely the World Wide Web and email services. While the internet, as a network of interconnected computers, has existed in various forms for some time, commencing with the Arpanet (United States), the freely accessible open network with www addresses and common code structure only started in the early 1990s. It seems that the historically correct term would be World Wide Web. However, given the current usage and terminological choices made in Court’s case-law, in the following the word ‘internet’ is primarily used to refer to the World Wide Web part of the network.
4 – The location of web pages is identified with an individual address, the ‘URL’ (Uniform Resource Locator), a system created in 1994. A web page can be accessed by typing its URL in the web browser, directly or with the help of a domain name. The web pages must be coded with some markup language. HyperText Markup Language (HTML) is the main markup language for creating web pages and other information that can be displayed in a web browser.
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