PARKERINGSKLAGENÆVNET

AFGØRELSE FRA PARKERINGSKLAGENÆVNET
12. marts 2026

Sagsnummer:	7480
Klageren:	[redacted]
Indklagede:	CITY PARKERINGSSERVICE A/S Postboks 204 2605 Brøndby
Klagen vedrører:	Kontrolafgift på kr. 795,- pålagt for overtrædelse af de skiltede vilkår om anvendelse af p-tilladelse. Køretøjet i sagen var på tidspunktet for kontrolafgiftens udstedelse parkeret uden gyldig p-tilladelse. Klager har fået 2 kontrolafgifter og har anført, at der ikke kan udstedes en kontrolafgift nr. 2 inden 24 timers udløb.
Parternes krav:	Klageren ønsker kontrolafgiften annulleret. Indklagede ønsker kontrolafgiften opretholdt.
Nævnets sammensætning:	Nævnsformand, dommer Mette Søgaard Vammen Uffe Jespersen, FDM Per Jensen, Forbrugerrådet Tænk Thomas Jørgensen, DPPB Steen Jørgensen, DPPB

SAGENS OMSTÆNDIGHEDER:

Denne sag vedrører en kontrolafgift pålagt den 7. maj 2022, kl. 09:19:14-09:24:21 for parkering med køretøjet med reg.nr. [redacted] på et område benævnt: "Marielyst Ferieby, Bøtøvej 111, 4873 Væggerløse".

Afgiften er pålagt med begrundelsen: "Parkering uden tilladelse".

Der er fremlagt foto af eksempel på skiltningen på p-pladsen. Af skiltningen fremgår:

"PARKERINGSREGLER
…
- Parkering tilladt i maks. 30 min. ved brug af p-skive /Parking is legal in max. 30 min. with the use of the parking disc og derudover kun tilladt med gyldig parkeringslicens eller gæstekort/

After the expiration, parking is only legal with the use of a parking license or guest card
- Køretøjer med gyldigt invalideskilt undtaget / Vehicles with valid handicap sign is excepted
- Overtrædelse vil medføre en kontrolafgift på DKK 795,- pr. påbegyndt døgn / In case if violation, a control fee is imposed of DKK 795 per started 24 hours.

…"

Af sagens oplysninger fremgår, at køretøjet var parkeret uden gyldig p-tilladelse.

PARTERNES SYNSPUNKTER OVER FOR PARKERINGSKLAGENÆVNET:

Klageren har særligt anført følgende:

"…
We have booked a vacation home from May 2nd to May 9th 2022 at the following address: Bøtølundvej 107 4873 Væggerløse

We had a parking ticket included with our vacation home for this period. Unfortunately, the ticket seems to have slipped from the dashboard under the windshield one day and fallen to the floor. We therefore kindly asked City Parkeringservice A/S to drop the charges for the parking ticket. They refused, whereupon we submitted another complaint saying that they should not have issued two tickets in the short time in order to get at least one ticket fee refunded.

We informed them that the sign in German and English states that a fee is due per 24 hour period not for a day started.

The parking fee for 36414119341965 starts on 06/05/2022 at 20:47 and therefore should run until 07/05/2022 20:47.

However, on 07/05/2022 at 09:24, a parking fee (36414119342039) was charged again.

City Parkeringservice A/S once again refused saying:
"As it stand on the sign, in case of a violation, a control fee is imposed of DKK 795, per started 24 hours. So it is per started 24 hours. "

It seems that they have not understood what we are referring to. We attached a high resolution photo of the sign we took on that day.
…"

"…
I do not agree with the Parking Company's statement.

In addition to your reference to the court judgment U.2014.1719H, it should also be noted that in another court judgment, similar to my case, the following was decided: Af Østre Landsret (U.2016.1396Ø) fremgår dog: "Landsretten tiltræder, at der i det foreliggende tilfælde med parkering fra den ene dags aften til den følgende dags morgen ikke er en rimelig sammenhæng mellem på den ene side omfanget og betydningen af A's overtrædelse af parkeringsvilkårene og på den anden side konsekvenserne for ham i form af to pålagte kontrolafgifter."
Roughly translated: The Østre Landsret (U.2016.1396Ø) states: "The national court accepts that in the present case, with parking from the evening of one day until the morning of the following day, there is no

reasonable connection between, on the one hand, the extent and significance of A's infringement of the parking conditions and, on the other hand the consequences for him in the form of two parking fines."

Giving a parking ticket in the evening as well as immediately the next morning is unreasonable, especially in my case, as I had a valid guest ticket for our holiday home.

The evening ticket, as you know, has already been paid for.
…"

Indklagede har særligt anført følgende:

"…
In support of maintaining the defendant's claim, the following is asserted:

That the complainant through their parking on the area Marielyst Ferieby, Bøtøvej 111, 4873 Væggerløse, on the 07.05.2022, implicitly accepted the private rules and regulations regarding said parking lot,

That it is presumed that the claimant has conducted the given parking, since they recognized as much in their letter to the Board of Parking Complaints/Parkeringsklagenævnet from the 01.06.2022,

That this case is about private parking regulations. These regulations are primarily determined through the Danish rules of contract law,

That the signs placed at the entrance to the parking lot live up to the requirement in BEK. 202 from the 28/02/2014 § 3, para 2. For this reason, it should have been clear to the claimant that the area is regulated by way of private rules and regulations.

That the signs on the parking lot clearly and concisely state the following:
- Parking is legal in max. 30 min. with the use of the parking disc / Parkering tilladt i maks. 30 min. ved brug af p-skive og,
- After the expiration, parking is only legal with the use of a parking license or guest card / derudover kun tilladt med gyldig parkeringslicens eller gæstekort,
- Vehicles with valid handicap sign is excepted / køretøjer med gyldigt invalideskilt undtaget,
- In case if violation, a control fee is imposed of DKK 795 per started 24 hours / Overtrædelse vil medføre en kontrolafgift på DKK 795,- pr. påbegyndt døgn,

(Appendix 2)

That in cases where the different languages of the parking restrictions may be interpreted differently, the Danish version of the text is to be considered the authoritative version,

The Danish version clearly states that a parking fee may be imposed "pr. påbegyndt døgn". This is the rule that applies even if this may not be the most obvious understanding of the translations,

That in the court decision U.2014.1719H, The Danish Supreme Court stated that "pr. påbegyndt døgn" is to be understood as meaning that a fee may be imposed for each start of a 24-hour day that the car Is parked,

That when the claimant's vehicle was observed on the 07.05.2022 in the period 09:19 – 09:24, there was no valid parking license visible in the windshield of the claimant's car, (Appendix 3)

That the complainant, for these reasons, did not uphold the rules and regulations applicable when they parked,

That the complainant, as the driver of the vehicle, bears the risk of the parking being done in accordance with the rules and regulations of the area,

That the complainant had ample opportunity to follow the rules and regulations of the parking lot

That the complainant is considered to have been made aware of the rules and regulations, and by the complainant parking on the parking lot they are considered to have accepted said regulations,

That the complainant has parked in a manner contrary to the regulations of the area, Marielyst Ferieby, Bøtøvej 111, 4873 Væggerløse. For this reason, the contested parking fine was issued,

That the complainant's objection to the fine with serial number 036414119342039 is contested in every regard,

That the signs in the parking lot at area Marielyst Ferieby, Bøtøvej 111, 4873 Væggerløse, are sufficiently clear, and that the claimant for this reason, through regular vigilance, would have been able to familiarise themselves with the rules and regulations of the parking lot,

That the parking ticket was issued rightly, and the complainant for this reason is obligated to pay the defendant their full claim.
…"

"…
The respondent has the following comments to its statement of defence from the 24th of June 2022.

The defendant notes that the claimant agrees with the defendant's understanding of the term "pr. påbegyndt døgn", which is based upon the understanding put forth by the Danish Supreme Court in the case U.2014.1719H.

According to previous cases from the Board of Parking Complaints, the case U.2016.1396Ø does not preclude that a parking fee may not be given one evening and the following morning. This may be seen from, among others, case 795. Instead, case U.2016.1396Ø is to be interpreted as meaning that it is disallowed to give a parking fee shortly before midnight and one before the following day can truly be said to have begun, since this would mean that two parking ticket de facto were given during the same night. This was not the case for the claimant, since the first parking fee was given at 20:47, and the next parking fee was given at 09:24, cf. Appendix 3 and 4.

For comparison, the fees in the case U.2016.1396Ø were given at 23:43 at night and 05:59 the following morning, meaning that they were de facto given the same night.

The respondent therefore maintains its full claim towards the complainant. This includes the fact that the ticket was issued rightly. The respondent refers to its previous comments and to its statement of defence from the 24th of June 2022.
…"

SAGENS DOKUMENTER:

Parternes indlæg og bilag.

PARKERINGSKLAGENÆVNETS BEGRUNDELSE OG RESULTAT:

Af skiltningen på området fremgår det, at parkering er tilladt i maks. 30 minutter ved brug af p-skive, og at parkering derudover kun tilladt med gyldig parkeringslicens eller gæstekort.

Parkeringsvagten har observeret køretøjet uden gyldig tilladelse den 7. maj 2022, kl. 09:19:14-09:24:21.

Klageren, som er fra Tyskland, har anført, at han var på ferie, og at han havde en gyldig parkeringstilladelse for perioden 2.-9. maj 2022, men at denne desværre på det tidspunkt var faldet ned på gulvet i bilen. Klageren har anført, at han fik 2 kontrolafgifter for denne forseelse.

Den første kontrolafgift blev udstedt den 6. maj 2022 kl. 20.47, og den anden kontrolafgift blev udstedt den 7. maj 2022 kl. 09:24.

Klager har anført, at der ifølge skiltningen på området ikke er hjemmel til allerede at udstede en kontrolafgift den 7. maj 2022 kl. 09:24, idet der ikke er forløbet 24 timer fra den første kontrolafgift blev udstedt.

Af den fremlagte fotodokumentation fremgår af den danske ordlyd på skiltningen, at "Overtrædelse vil medføre en kontrolafgift på DKK 795,- pr. påbegyndt døgn"

Det fremgår af den engelske ordlyd på skiltningen, at " In case if violation, a control fee is imposed of DKK 795 per started 24 hours".

Herefter og da parkeringsvilkårenes engelske ordlyd, som er den klageren har læst, angiver, at "In case if violation, a control fee is imposed of DKK 795 per started 24 hours", er kontrolafgiften af 7. maj 2022 ikke udstedt med rette.

CITY PARKERINGSSERVICE A/S er således ikke berettiget til at opretholde kravet om betaling af kontrolafgiften udstedt den 7. maj 2022.

PARKERINGSKLAGENÆVNETS AFGØRELSE:

CITY PARKERINGSSERVICE A/S er ikke berettiget til at opretholde kravet om betaling af kontrolafgift på kr. 795,-.

Indklagede skal betale kr. 3.500,- i sagsomkostninger til Parkeringsklagenævnet, som sender en opkrævning til indklagede.

Klagegebyret tilbagebetales til klageren.

Der er ikke taget stilling til øvrige sagsomkostninger.

Hver af parterne kan anlægge sag ved domstolene om de forhold, som klagen har vedrørt.

Klageren henvises til at søge yderligere oplysning om eventuel bistand i forbindelse med sagsanlæg på www.domstol.dk, www.advokatsamfundet.dk og/eller eget forsikringsselskab om eventuel retshjælpsforsikring.

På Parkeringsklagenævnets vegne

Mette Søgaard Vammen
Nævnsformand