

EDITOR'S NOTE: YOUR GREATEST DATA PRIVACY RISK

Victoria Prussen Spears

MITIGATING YOUR GREATEST DATA PRIVACY RISK: HOW TO ESTABLISH AN EFFECTIVE VENDOR MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Kathryn T. Allen and Kelsey L. Brandes

NAVIGATING THE HIPAA RISKS OF WEBSITE TRACKERS

Alexander Dworkowitz and Scott T. Lashway

MARITIME RANSOMWARE

Vanessa C. DiDomenico, Sharon R. Klein and Karen H. Shin

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION PROPOSES FURTHER RESTRICTIONS ON META'S PRIVACY PRACTICES AND A COMPLETE PROHIBITION ON META MONETIZING YOUTH DATA

Christopher N. Olsen and Nikhil Goyal

LIMIT YOUR HEALTH DATA SHARING AND CALL ME IN THE MORNING: FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION PRESCRIBES ENFORCEMENT OF THE HEALTH BREACH NOTIFICATION RULE

Kathleen Benway, David C. Keating, Sara Pullen Guercio and Hyun Jai Oh

WASHINGTON TRANSFORMS CONSUMER HEALTH DATA LANDSCAPE WITH PASSAGE OF MY HEALTH MY DATA ACT

Meghan O'Connor and Kiana Baharloo

ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES SCOPE OF STATE'S BIOMETRIC INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT CLAIMS: FIVE YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND CONTINUOUS ACCRUAL OF CLAIMS

Kathleen L. Carlson, Lawrence P. Fogel, Geeta Malhotra, Stephen W. McInerney, Vera M. Iwankiw, Andrew F. Rodheim and Carly R. Owens

ÖSTERREICHISCHE POST: EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE SPECIFIES THE REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPENSATION FOR BREACHES OF GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION

Huw Beverley-Smith and Jeanine E. Leahy

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 9	NUMBER 6	July - August 2023
Editor's Note: Your Greate Victoria Prussen Spears	est Data Privacy Risk	183
Mitigating Your Greatest l Vendor Management Proc	Data Privacy Risk: How to Establis	h an Effective
Kathryn T. Allen and Kelsey		186
Navigating the HIPAA Ris Alexander Dworkowitz and		191
Maritime Ransomware Vanessa C. DiDomenico, Si	haron R. Klein and Karen H. Shin	194
	n Proposes Further Restrictions on Prohibition on Meta Monetizing Yo Nikhil Goyal	•
Commission Prescribes E	haring and Call Me in the Morning nforcement of the Health Breach N . Keating, Sara Pullen Guercio and H	otification Rule
Washington Transforms C My Health My Data Act	Consumer Health Data Landscape w	vith Passage of
Meghan O'Connor and Kia	ana Baharloo	208
	larifies Scope of State's Biometric In Year Statute of Limitations and Con	
Kathleen L. Carlson, Lawre	ence P. Fogel, Geeta Malhotra, Stephe F. Rodheim and Carly R. Owens	n W. McInerney,
	opean Court of Justice Specifies the aches of General Data Protection F	
Huw Beverley-Smith and Je		218



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact: Alexandra Jefferies at
Customer Services Department at
Your account manager or

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print) ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online) Cite this publication as:

 $[author\ name],\ [\textit{article\ title}],\ [vol.\ no.]\ PRATT'S\ PRIVACY\ \&CYBERSECURITY\ LAW\ REPORT\ [page\ number]$

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [1] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [82] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license.A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt Publication Editorial

Editorial Offices 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800 201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW **\ODER**

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Baker & McKenzie LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

Österreichische Post: European Court of Justice Specifies the Requirements for Compensation for Breaches of General Data Protection Regulation

By Huw Beverley-Smith and Jeanine E. Leahy*

In this article, the authors discuss a decision by the European Court of Justice ruling that a claimant must be able to prove that an alleged violation of the General Data Protection Regulation has caused the claimant actual non-material damage to be able to receive compensation.

The European Court of Justice (CJEU) has delivered its highly anticipated judgement in *Österreichische Post (Case C-300/21)* on a crucial issue: the extent to which data subjects affected by a breach of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) have a right to compensation for non-material damage under Article 82 GDPR.

BACKGROUND

The underlying case arose from a data subject in Austria seeking 1,000 EUR (\$1,009) in compensation for alleged non-material damages arising from Österreichische Post's processing of his personal data for the purposes of political advertising. The individual had not consented to the processing and claimed that he felt offended by the fact that an affinity to a certain political party was attributed to him, alongside feelings of great upset, loss of confidence and exposure caused by the retention of his data on these supposed political opinions.

The Austrian Supreme Court had referred various questions to the CJEU regarding the substantiality threshold for compensation for non-material damage, including whether the applicant must have suffered harm, or if an infringement of the GDPR in itself is sufficient for an award of compensation.

THE KEY FINDINGS OF THE CJEU

The CJEU found that to have a right to compensation under the Article 82 GDPR, three cumulative conditions must be met:

- 1. The existence of an infringement of the GDPR;
- 2. A damage (material or non-material) resulting from that infringement; and
- 3. A causal link between the damage and the infringement.

^{&#}x27;Huw Beverley-Smith (huw.beverley-smith@faegredrinker.com) is a partner in the London office of Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP. Jeanine E. Leahy is a trainee solicitor at the firm.

Accordingly, not every "mere" infringement of the GDPR will be sufficient, by itself, to give rise to a right to compensation.

Regarding the second condition, the CJEU found that the right to compensation is not limited to non-material damage that reaches a certain threshold of seriousness. There is no such threshold in the GDPR, and such a limitation would not be consistent with the broad conception of damage in the GDPR and could lead to fluctuating decisions as national courts interpreted the appropriate threshold in different ways.

Finally, the CJEU stated that, as the GDPR does not contain any rules governing the assessment of damages, it is for the legal system of each EU member state to set out the criteria for determining the extent of compensation payable, provided that the principles of equivalence and effectiveness are complied with. This will therefore be a question for national courts, applying their domestic rules, although the CJEU did note that the right to financial compensation under Article 82 must be "full and effective" and compensate for any damage actually suffered as a result of the infringement in its entirety.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The decision is welcome confirmation that a claimant must be able to prove that an alleged GDPR violation has caused them actual non-material damage. It will not be sufficient for individuals to merely assert a breach of their rights and the requirements to prove damage and causation will be relatively high barriers to more frivolous claims.

Unfortunately, the decision does not provide any guidance on what is meant by non-material damage. For businesses defending claims, the absence of any requirement for seriousness is less welcome. We can expect significant variation across the EU (the UK has its own separate lines of authority following Brexit) in determining how to measure the amount of compensation payable, potentially leading to forum shopping by prospective claimants seeking the highest levels of damages. Further cases are pending in the CJEU on the scope of material and non-material damage; businesses should track these developments closely when formulating responses to claims from data subjects.

Businesses should also monitor the progress of the implementation of the new EU Collective Redress Directive, which has the potential to provide the legal framework for data class actions to be brought in significant numbers, which will add to the scale of complexities of defending claims for non-material damage.