

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case Number: 25-25088-CIV-MARTINEZ/Sanchez

GOYARD ST-HONORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

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

Defendants. _____

_____ /

ORDER AUTHORIZING ALTERNATE SERVICE OF PROCESS IN PART

THIS CAUSE came before this Court upon Plaintiff, Goyard St-Honore’s *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants . . . [ECF No. 9]. This Court has reviewed the Motion, the record, and applicable law. After careful consideration, the Motion is **GRANTED in part**.

On November 4, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief [ECF No. 1] alleging that Defendants — individuals, business entities, and unincorporated associations — are “knowingly and intentionally promoting, advertising, distributing, offering for sale, and selling goods bearing counterfeits and infringements of Goyard’s registered trademarks” through unauthorized e-commerce stores. (Mot. 2; *see generally* Compl.).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have established Internet-based businesses and utilize electronic means as reliable forms of contact. (*Id.* 3 (citing Ex. 1, T. Raquel Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. (“Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl.”) [ECF No. 9-1] ¶¶ 3–5)). And Plaintiff also contends that it has good cause to believe Defendants live or operate outside the United States. (*See* Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. ¶ 9 (listing China, Hong Kong, Macao, India, Ukraine, Brazil, Mexico, Sweden,

Pakistan, Romania, and the United Arab Emirates)). Therefore, Plaintiff seeks to serve Defendants by both e-mail and website posting. (*See generally* Mot.). To facilitate service, Plaintiff has created a dedicated website at <https://servingnotice.com/YpfPtg/index.html>, where the Complaint and all other filings in this action are available for public access upon providing Defendants with notice of this action. (*See id.* 3).

Alternative service comports with due process in this case. E-mail and posting on Plaintiff's designated website are reasonably calculated to give notice to Defendants because Defendants use at least one known valid form of electronic contact to conduct their Internet-based businesses. (*See id.* 8). Moreover, Plaintiff has created a website for the sole purpose of providing notice of this action to Defendants, the address for which will be provided to Defendants' known e-mail accounts, onsite contact forms, and/or private messaging accounts and/or services. (*See id.*). Therefore, Plaintiff's suggested methods are "reasonably calculated, under all circumstances, to apprise [Defendants] of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." *Brookshire Bros., Ltd. v. Chiquita Brands Int'l, Inc.*, No. 05-cv-21962, 2007 WL 1577771, at *1 (S.D. Fla. May 31, 2007).

The Court also finds that alternative service of process for almost all of the Defendants is not prohibited by international agreement. Rule 4(h)(2) for the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure describes the various ways a plaintiff may serve foreign entities and incorporates the service methods set forth in Rule 4(f). Rule 4(f)(3), in turn, allows a district court to order an alternate method for service to be executed on foreign defendants, provided it is not prohibited by international agreement and is reasonably calculated to give notice to the defendants. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3); *see also Brookshire Bros.*, 2007 WL 1577771, at *2 (noting that "district courts have broad discretion under Rule 4(f)(3) to authorize other methods of service that are consistent

with due process and are not prohibited by international agreements.” (citing *Prewitt Enters., Inc. v. Org. of Petroleum Exp. Countries*, 353 F.3d 916, 921, 927 (11th Cir. 2003))).

Plaintiff believes that Defendants reside and/or operate in China, including Hong Kong and Macao, India, Ukraine, Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, Pakistan, Romania, and the United Arab Emirates. (*See id.* 13 (citing Ex. 1, T. Raquel Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. (“Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl.”) [ECF No. 9-1] ¶ 9)). The United States, China, Hong Kong, Macao, India, Ukraine, Brazil, Mexico, Sweden, Pakistan, and Romania are signatories to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extra-Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters, which does not specifically preclude service by e-mail and internet publication. (*See* Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. ¶ 10; *see also* Mot. 14). While China, India, Ukraine, Brazil, and Mexico have objected to the alternative means of service provided for by Article 10 of the Convention (*see* Mot. 15 (citing Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. ¶ 10)), “[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) (alteration added; citation and footnote call number omitted); *Stat Med. Devices, Inc. v. HTL-Strefa, Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-20590-FAM, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122000, at *8–9 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2015).

While the Court concludes Plaintiff’s requested service methods for Defendants residing or operating in the signatory nations are not prohibited by international agreement, *see Gurung v. Malhotra*, 279 F.R.D. 215, 219–20 (S.D.N.Y. 2011), Plaintiff alleges that three Defendants — Defendants 6, 10, and 23 on Plaintiff’s Schedule A — reside or operate in the United Arab Emirates (*see* Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl., Ex. 1 [ECF No. 9-2] 2–3). Plaintiff states that the United

Case Number: 25-25088-CIV-MARTINEZ

Arab Emirates is not a signatory to the Hague Convention (*see id.* ¶ 10; *see also* Mot. 14), but it fails to explain why its proposed method of alternative service is an appropriate method of service for defendants residing in a non-signatory nation. (*See generally* Mot.). Without this information, the Court is unable to ascertain whether authorizing alternative service is appropriate against these three Defendants.

In sum, Plaintiff has shown good cause why leave should be granted to allow service of the summons, the Complaint, and all other filings in this matter via e-mail or posting on Plaintiff's designated website against all Defendants apart from Defendants 6, 10, and 23. (*See generally* Mot.). Thus, the Court will exercise its discretion to allow service on those Defendants through e-mail and website posting.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Plaintiff, Goyard St-Honore's *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants . . . [ECF No. 9] is **GRANTED in part** as follows:


- a. Plaintiff may serve summons, a copy of the Complaint [ECF No. 1], and all other future filings in this matter, on all Defendants — except for Defendants 6, 10, and 23 on Plaintiff's Schedule A [ECF No. 9-2] — by providing Plaintiff's designated serving notice website to the e-mail accounts provided by Defendants as part of the data related to its domain name, including customer service e-mail addresses, onsite contact forms, and/or private messaging accounts and/or services, or via the designated registrar of record for each of the domain names. in this action; and
- b. Plaintiff may serve summons, a copy of the Complaint, and all other future filings in this matter, upon all Defendants — except for Defendants 6, 10, and 23 on Plaintiff's

Case Number: 25-25088-CIV-MARTINEZ

Schedule A — by posting a copy of the same on Plaintiff's designated serving notice website available at <https://servingnotice.com/YpfPtg/index.html>.

c. If Plaintiff chooses, it may file an additional motion for alternative service of process on Defendants 6, 10, and 23 that addresses the Court's concerns regarding Plaintiff's ability to effectuate service against those three Defendants in the United Arab Emirates.

DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Florida, this 19th day of November 2025.



CECILIA M. ALTONAGA
for JOSE E. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc: counsel of record