

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 25-25088-CIV-MARTINEZ

GOYARD ST-HONORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

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

Defendants.

**ORDER AUTHORIZING ALTERNATE SERVICE OF PROCESS
ON DEFENDANTS 6, 10, AND 23**

THIS CAUSE came before this Court on Plaintiff, Goyard St-Honore's Renewed Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process . . . [ECF No. 20], filed on December 1, 2025. The Court has reviewed the Motion, pertinent portions of the record, and applicable law and is otherwise fully advised.

On November 11, 2025, Plaintiff filed its *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process [ECF No. 9], which the Court granted in part (*see* Nov. 19, 2025 Order [ECF No. 12]). The Court permitted Plaintiff to serve all Defendants via email and website posting, except for Defendants 6, 10, and 23, who reside in or operate from the United Arab Emirates, a non-signatory to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extra-Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters. (*See generally id.*).

Plaintiff filed the instant Motion addressing its proposed method of service for the Defendants located in a non-signatory nation and seeking an order authorizing alternative service of process. (*See generally* Mot.). Plaintiff states that Defendants 6, 10, and 23 have established

Internet-based businesses and utilize electronic means as reliable forms of contact. (*See id.* 4–6). Plaintiff also has good cause to believe Defendants 6, 10, and 23 live or operate outside the United States. (*See id.* 15 (citing Ex. 1, T. Raquel Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl. (“Wiborg-Rodriguez Decl.”) [ECF No. 9-2] 2–3 (listing United Arab Emirates as suspected domicile location for Defendants 6, 10, and 23))). Therefore, Plaintiff seeks to serve Defendants 6, 10, and 23 by both e-mail and website posting. (*See id.* 1). 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.* 4).

Rule 4(h)(2) for the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure describes the various ways in which a plaintiff may serve foreign entities and incorporates the service methods set forth in Rule 4(f). Rule 4(f)(3) provides that service may be accomplished “by other means not prohibited by international agreement, as the court orders.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3); *see also Brookshire Bros., Ltd. v. Chiquita Brands Int’l, Inc.*, No. 05-cv-21962, 2007 WL 1577771, at *2 (S.D. Fla. May 31, 2007) (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))).

The Court finds that alternative service of process under Rule 4(f)(3) is warranted. First, the requested service methods are not prohibited by international agreement. Defendants 6, 10, and 23 are in a non-signatory nation to the Hague Convention. As such, the Hague Convention does not impact whether Defendants 6, 10, and 23 can be served via the alternate methods requested. Plaintiff has not identified any other treaties between the United States and the United

Arab Emirates that governs service of process in a civil matter. (*See* Mot. 2).

Plaintiff also notes that Article 9 of the United Arab Emirates Civil Procedure Code expressly permits service on defendants via email or other modern means of communication; therefore, such methods of service do not contravene the United Arab Emirates Civil Procedure Code. (*See* Annie O’Leary Decl. in Support of Plaintiff’s Renewed Motion for Alternate Service (“O’Leary Decl.”) [ECF No. 20-1] ¶ 6; *see also* Ex. 1, O’Leary Decl. [ECF No. 20-2] (containing the General Provisions of the United Arab Emirates’ Federal Decree-Law No. (42) of 2022 Promulgating the Civil Procedure Code, including Article 9)).

Moreover, Defendants 6, 10, and 23 use at least one known form of electronic contact to conduct their Internet-based businesses, and Plaintiff created a website for the sole purpose of providing notice of this action to Defendants, the addresses for which will be provided to Defendants 6, 10, and 23’s known e-mail accounts, onsite contact forms, and/or private messaging accounts and/or services. (*See* Mot. 3–6). Therefore, service via e-mail and through posting on a designated website is “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.*, 2007 WL 1577771, at *1 (alteration added). Thus, the Court will exercise its discretion to allow service on Defendants 6, 10, and 23 through e-mail and website posting.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Plaintiff, Goyard St-Honore’s Renewed Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants 6, 10, and 23 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3) [ECF No. 20], is **GRANTED** as follows:

- a. Plaintiff may serve the summonses, Amended Complaint [ECF No. 14], and all other future filings and discovery in this matter on Defendants 6, 10, and 23 on Plaintiff’s Schedule A (Mot. at 19), by providing Plaintiff’s designated serving notice website to

CASE NO. 25-25088-CIV-MARTINEZ

the e-mail accounts provided by Defendants 6, 10, and 23 as part of the data related to their domain names, 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 the summonses, Amended Complaint, and all other future filings and discovery in this matter on Defendants 6, 10, and 23 on Plaintiff's Schedule A by posting a copy of the same on Plaintiff's designated serving notice website available at <https://servingnotice.com/YpfPtg/index.html>.

DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Florida, this 4th day of December 2025.



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

cc: counsel of record