

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 24-61222-CIV-SMITH

ADIDAS AG, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

THE INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESS ENTITIES,
AND UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE "A,"

Defendants.

SEALED ORDER AUTHORIZING ALTERNATE SERVICE OF PROCESS

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3) [DE 7]. For the reasons stated herein, the Motion is **GRANTED**.

This is a federal trademark counterfeiting and infringement case in which Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, through various Internet based e-commerce stores, are advertising, promoting, offering for sale, or selling goods bearing and/or using what Plaintiffs have determined to be counterfeits, infringements, reproductions and/or colorable imitations of Plaintiffs' registered trademarks. In the Motion, Plaintiffs request an order authorizing service of process on Defendants by e-mail and website posting. Plaintiffs contend that electronic service by these means is sufficient to provide notice to Defendants, who reside in or operate from the People's Republic of China ("China"), the Socialist Republic of Vietnam ("Vietnam"), the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ("United Kingdom"), and the Republic of Singapore ("Singapore"),

and have established Internet-based businesses and utilize electronic means as reliable forms of contact. (See Gigante Decl. [DE 7-2] ¶¶ 3–5, 7.)

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3) permits a district court to order an alternate method for service to be effected upon foreign defendants, provided it is not prohibited by international agreement and is reasonably calculated to give notice to the defendants. See *Brookshire Bros. v. Chiquita Brands Int’l, Inc.*, No. 05-CIV-21962, 2007 WL 1577771, at *2 (S.D. Fla. May 31, 2007) (citing *Prewitt Enters., Inc. v. Org. of Petroleum Exp. Countries*, 353 F.3d 916, 921, 927 (11th Cir. 2003)). “Constitutional due process requires only that service of process provide ‘notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.’” *Chanel, Inc. v. Zhixian*, No. 10-CV-60585, 2010 WL 1740695, at *3 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 29, 2010) (citing *Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)). “A party seeking authorization for alternate service under Rule 4(f)(3) need not attempt service by those methods enumerated under subsections (f)(1) and (f)(2), including by diplomatic channels and letters rogatory, before petitioning the Court for 4(f)(3) relief.” *Sec. & Exch. Comm’n v. Palm House Hotel, LLLP*, No. 18-CV-81038, 2018 WL 9849603, at *1–2 (S.D. Fla. Nov. 7, 2018) (citation omitted). “The decision to accept or deny service by alternate means pursuant to Rule 4(f)(3) falls soundly within the discretion of the district court.” *Id.* at *2.

Here, service by e-mail and web publication are not prohibited by international agreement. The United States, China, Vietnam, the United Kingdom and Singapore are signatories to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extra-Judicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (“Hague Service Convention”). See Status Table: Convention of 15 November 1965 on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or

Commercial Matters, <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/?cid=17> (last visited August 16, 2024) (listing current contracting states). The Hague Convention does not specifically preclude service by e-mail and Internet publication. Further, “[w]here a signatory nation has objected to the alternative means of service provided by the Hague Convention, that objection is expressly limited to those means and does not represent an objection to other forms of service, such as e-mail or publication.” *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Store*, No. 18-61624-CIV, 2018 WL 8060707, at *1 (S.D. Fla. July 26, 2018) (citation omitted). “A court acting under Rule 4(f)(3) therefore remains free to order alternative means of service where a signatory nation has not expressly objected to those means.” *Id.* China, Vietnam, the United Kingdom, and Singapore have not objected to service by e-mail or Internet publication.¹ Accordingly, service by these means do not violate an international agreement.

Additionally, due process is not offended. Defendants have at least one known form of electronic contact and Plaintiffs have created a website for the sole purpose of providing notice of this action to Defendants. The address to this website will be provided to Defendants through their known e-mail accounts and onsite contact forms embedded in Defendants’ respective e-commerce store names. Service by e-mail and website posting are therefore reasonably calculated, under all circumstances, to apprise Defendants of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections. Moreover, these are the most likely means of communication to reach

¹ While China, Vietnam, and Singapore have declared that they oppose, either fully or partially, to the service of documents in their respective territories by the alternative means of service outlined in Article 10 of the Convention, including the service of process by postal channels, they have not expressly objected to service via e-mail or publication. Further, the United Kingdom has not objected to service by postal channels outlined in Article 10(a) of the Convention, nor has it expressly objected to service via e-mail or publication (*See Gigante Decl.* ¶ 8 at n.4.; <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/notifications/?csid=393&disp=resdn>, <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/notifications/?csid=1337&disp=resdn>, <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventionans/status-table/notifications/?csid=427&disp=resdn>, and <https://www.hcch.net/en/instruments/conventions/status-table/notifications/?csid=1512&disp=resdn>).


Defendants, who operate via the Internet and rely on electronic communications for the operation of their businesses. *See Tiffany (NJ) LLC v. DORAPANG Franchise Store*, No. 18-CV-61590-UU, 2018 WL 4828430, at *3 (S.D. Fla. July 17, 2018). Thus, the Court will exercise its discretion to allow service on Defendants through e-mail and website posting. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Motion [DE 7] is **GRANTED**. Plaintiffs are permitted to serve the Summonses, Complaint, and all other filings and discovery in this matter upon each Defendant:

a) by providing the address to Plaintiffs' designated serving notice website to Defendants via the e-mail addresses provided by each Defendant as part of the data related to its e-commerce store, including customer service e-mail addresses, onsite contact forms, private messaging applications and/or services, or via the registrar of record for each of the e-commerce stores;² **and**

b) by publicly posting a copy of the Summonses, Complaint, and all filings in this matter on Plaintiffs' designated serving notice website appearing at <https://servingnotice.com/D35a1x5/index.html>.

DONE AND ORDERED in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, this 19th day of August, 2024.



RODNEY SMITH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc: counsel of record

² Defendants' E-commerce Store Names and associated means of contact are listed on Schedule "A" to the Motion.