

FILED

NOV 07 2019

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WEST. DIST. OF PENNSYLVANIA

GORGE DESIGN GROUP, LLC, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No. 19-1454

v.

ACCESSMALL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

FILED UNDER SEAL

**PLAINTIFFS' EX PARTE MOTION FOR AN ORDER
AUTHORIZING ALTERNATIVE SERVICE ON DEFENDANTS
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 4(f)(3)**

Plaintiffs Gorge Design Group, LLC (“Gorge Design Group”) and Kirby Erdely (“Erdely”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), hereby move this Court on an *ex parte* basis,¹ for an order authorizing alternate service of process on Defendants, the Individuals, Partnerships, and Unincorporated Associations identified on **Schedule “A”** hereto (collectively “Defendants”), brought pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3). In support thereof, Plaintiffs submit the following:

¹ Plaintiffs are moving for alternate service *ex parte* as Plaintiffs have yet to provide Defendants with notice of this action. Contemporaneously herewith, Plaintiffs have filed their *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, and Order Restraining Transfer of Assets (“*Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order”), together with the supporting Declarations and Exhibits. The present Motion makes reference to Plaintiffs’ *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, and as such, Plaintiffs seek to prevent premature disclosure of that filing. (See Declaration of Stanley D. Ference III in Support of Plaintiffs’ *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants [“*Ference Dec.*”] ¶ 1, n.1, filed herewith.) However, Plaintiffs are filing this Motion so that, in the event Plaintiffs’ *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order and the instant Motion are granted, Plaintiffs can effectuate service of process pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure simultaneously with providing notice of the Court’s order on Plaintiffs’ *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order. (See *id.*)

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs are suing Defendants for federal unfair competition in violation of Section 43(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended; infringing the claims of Plaintiffs' U.S. Patent No. 7,309,198 in violation of the Patent Act; common law unfair competition; and common law trademark infringement, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), 35 U.S.C. § 271, and The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). Defendants are knowingly and intentionally promoting, advertising, distributing, offering for sale, and selling knock-off versions of Plaintiffs' ULTIMATE GROUND ANCHOR™ (the "Infringing Product") which closely mimic the appearance of Plaintiffs' genuine product within this district and throughout the United States by operating e-commerce stores established at least via the Internet marketplace websites wish.com, aliexpress.com, and eBay.com under their Store Names and Seller Names identified on Schedule "A" hereto (the "Seller IDs"). Defendants have violated Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act by using Plaintiffs' photographs and/or common law ULTIMATE GROUND ANCHOR trademark; infringed upon the claims of Plaintiffs' patent; and Defendants have also engage in common law unfair competition and trademark infringement, all while marketing their knock-off products in a willful attempt to pass them off as genuine products;

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3), Plaintiffs request an order authorizing service of process on Defendants via electronic communication ("e-mail") and via website publication. E-mail and website publication service are appropriate and necessary in this case, because Defendants (1) operate via the Internet, and (2) rely on electronic communications to operate their businesses. As such, Plaintiffs have the ability to contact Defendants directly and provide notice of Plaintiffs' claims against them electronically via e-mail. Additionally, Plaintiffs have created a publication website and will be posting copies of the Complaint,

Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, this instant Motion, and all other documents filed in this action. Plaintiffs respectfully submit that an order allowing service of process and future filings² via e-mail and by publication on a designated website will benefit all parties and the Court by ensuring Defendants receive immediate notice of the pendency of this action and allowing this action to move forward expeditiously. Absent the ability to serve Defendants by email and/or website publication, Plaintiffs will almost certainly be left without the ability to pursue a remedy.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Defendants Have Valid and Operational Means of Electronic Contact.

Defendants operate Internet-based businesses and use electronic means of communication such that Plaintiff will be able to provide Defendants with notice of this action via e-mail and website publication. As a practical matter, it is necessary for merchants who operate entirely online, such as Defendants, to provide customers with valid electronic means by which customers may contact the merchants to ask questions about the merchants' products, place orders from the merchants, and receive information from the merchants regarding the shipments of orders. Further, e-commerce defendants generally must maintain accurate e-mail addresses where their marketplace platforms and payment processor may communicate with them regarding issues related to their e-commerce store accounts and transfer of funds for the payment for goods. Plaintiff has also created a webpage on www.ferencelaw.com ("Plaintiffs'

² Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 governs service of pleadings and other papers once service of process has been made. Service is not required on any party that fails to appear. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(a)(2). Nonetheless, Plaintiffs propose to continue to serve pleadings and other papers via e-mail and by posting on a designated website.

Website”), such that anyone accessing Plaintiffs’ Website will find copies of documents filed in this action. (See *Ference Dec.*, ¶¶ 5 - 6.)

eBay.com, Inc., which operates the eBay.com marketplace maintains contact e-mail addresses for sellers operating via their marketplaces, and based upon past actions, eBay.com, Inc. identifies these contact e-mail addresses for Defendants at issue upon compliance with a temporary restraining order, such as the temporary restraining order Plaintiffs are requesting in the instant case. (See *Ference Dec.*, ¶ 3.) Additionally, Defendants operating their respective e-commerce stores via the Internet marketplace website ebay.com have provided an electronic form of contact in the form of eBay’s messaging system. (*Id.*) eBay’s messaging system facilitates communication between customers and merchants in the eBay.com marketplace. (*Id.*)

Furthermore, sellers operating via eBay.com use money transfer and retention services with PayPal, Inc. (“PayPal”), as a method to receive monies generated through the sale of Infringing Products. Defendants have provided at least one accurate contact email address to PayPal in order to conduct business via their respective Seller IDs. (*See* *Ference Dec.*, ¶ 4.) Defendants’ PayPal account e-mail addresses must necessarily be valid, working e-mail addresses; otherwise, Defendants would not be able to process payments through their PayPal accounts.³ (See *Id.*) Moreover, pursuant to PayPal’s Electronic Communications Delivery Policy (E-Sign Disclosure and Consent), PayPal account holders consent to receive all communication electronically, including via e-mail, and are required to maintain a valid e-mail address. If PayPal discovers an e-mail address has become invalid such that electronic communications sent to the e-mail address by PayPal are returned, PayPal may deem the account

³ See PayPal’s Electronic Communications Delivery Policy (E-Sign Disclosure and Consent), available at <https://www.paypal.com/us/webapps/mpp/ua/esign-full> (last visited May 15, 2019).

to be inactive and disable transaction activity until a valid, working e-mail address is provided. (See *Id.*) Based upon past actions, PayPal identifies these contact e-mail address for all Defendants at issue upon compliance with a temporary restraining order, such as the temporary order Plaintiffs are requesting in the instant case. (*Id.*)

Context Logic, Inc., which operates the wish.com website, maintains contact e-mail addresses for sellers operating via Wish.com, and based upon past actions, ContextLogic, Inc. identifies these additional contact e-mail addresses for all Defendants at issue upon compliance with a temporary restraining order, such as the temporary restraining order Plaintiffs are requesting in the instant case. (*Id.*, ¶ 5.)

AliExpress.com's ("AliExpress") Messaging Service is an available means for contacting sellers on that online marketplace. The AliExpress Messaging Service is a system that facilitates communication between customers and merchants in the AliExpress marketplace. By using the Messaging Service, a customer can communicate with an AliExpress merchant via a unique anonymized electronic mail ("e-mail") address. This anonymized e-mail alias is treated in the same way as a real e-mail address.⁴ Additionally, AliExpress allows a customer to see a copy of the message on the Messages Center page in the customer's account. More importantly, customers are automatically notified when an e-mail message is not delivered to the merchant. (*Id.*, ¶ 6.)

Accordingly, each Defendant will be provided with notice of this action electronically by providing the address to Plaintiffs' Website (discussed *supra*) to their corresponding e-mail addresses and/or direct messaging or inquiry system that Defendants use to conduct their commercial transactions via the Sellers IDs. (*Ference Dec.*, ¶ 7.) In this manner, Defendants

⁴ See Communicating with the supplier, available at http://activities.aliexpress.com/adcms/help-aliexpress-com/communicate_with_supplier.php (last visited February 6, 2019).

will receive a web address at which they can access all electronic filings to view, print, or download any document filed in the case similar to the court's CM/ECF procedures.

Finally, Plaintiffs will be able to provide each Defendant notice of this action via public announcement on Plaintiffs' designated website. Plaintiffs have created a publication website that will be appearing on www.ferencelaw.com ("Plaintiffs' Website), whereupon copies of the Complaint, Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, this Motion, discovery, and other filings, and orders issued in this action will be posted, such that anyone accessing Plaintiffs' Website will find copies of documents filed in this action similar to the Court's CM/ECF procedures. (*Ference Dec.*, ¶ 7.) The address for Plaintiffs' Website will be provided to Defendants via their e-mail accounts provided by AliExpress, eBay, Context Logic and/or PayPal, or through the respective direct messaging or inquiry system, and will be included as part of service of process in this matter. (*Id.*)

B. Defendants Rely on Electronic Communications.

Defendants have structured their e-commerce store businesses so that the sole means for customers to purchase Defendants' goods at issue is by placing an order electronically. Defendants take and confirm orders online and rely on electronic means to receive a payment. (*See Declaration of Mary Laplante in Support of Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, and Order Restraining Transfer of Assets ["Laplante Dec."]* ¶ 3 and Comp. Ex. 1 thereto.) During the investigation, Plaintiffs were able to view Defendants' Infringing Products, add products to the online shopping cart, proceed to a point of checkout, add a shipping address in this judicial district and payment information and otherwise actively exchange data with each Merchant Storefront. (*Id.*) Clearly, Defendants rely on electronic means as reliable forms of contact.

III. ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(h)(2), a foreign partnership or other unincorporated association may be served with process in any manner prescribed by Rule 4(f) for serving foreign individuals. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3), allows a district court to authorize an alternate method for service to be effected upon a foreign defendant, provided that it is not prohibited by international agreement and is reasonably calculated to give notice to the defendant. In the present matter, alternate service of process via e-mail and website publication are appropriate given that Defendants have established Internet-based businesses by which they rely on electronic communications for their operation. Accordingly, this Court should permit service on Defendants by e-mail and website publication.

A. The Court May Authorize Service via Electronic Mail and Website Publication Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3).

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) enables a foreign business entity to be served with process using an alternative method of service so long as the alternative method: (1) “is not prohibited by international agreement” and (2) “comports with constitutional notions of due process”. *Henry F. Teichmann, Inc. v. Caspian Flat Glass OJSC*, No. 13-cv-458, 2013 WL 1644808 at *1, *2 (W.D. Pa. April 16, 2013) (Hornak, J.). Notably, “[s]ervice under subsection [4(f)] (3) is neither a last resort nor extraordinary relief. It is merely one means among several which enables service of process on an international defendant.” *Sulzer Mixpac AG v. Medenstar Indus. Co.*, 312 F.R.D. 329, 330 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (quoting *Advanced Aerofoil Techs., AG v. Todaro*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12383, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2012) (internal citations omitted)). Since third-party merchants on Internet marketplaces, like Defendants, have been known to use aliases, false addresses and other incomplete identification information to shield their true identities and there

are, in fact, no physical addresses whatsoever associated with the majority of Defendants' User Accounts, this is exactly the circumstance where the courts should exercise, as they previously have exercised, the authority to grant alternative methods of service. *See Id.* (quoting *Madu, Edozie & Madu, P.C. v. SocketWorks Ltd. Nigeria*, 265 F.R.D. 106, 115 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (“The decision whether to allow alternative methods of serving process under Rule 4(f)(3) is committed to the sound discretion of the district court.”) (internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also Ference Dec.*, ¶¶ 3 - 8.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) permits service in a place not within any judicial district of the United States⁵ “by any internationally agreed means of service that is reasonably calculated to give notice”. *See Rio Props. v. Rio Intern. Interlink*, 284 F. 3d 1007, 1014 (9th Cir. 2002). The Ninth Circuit in *Rio Props.* held, “without hesitation,” that e-mail service of an online business defendant “was constitutionally acceptable.” *Id.* at 1017. The Court reached this conclusion, in part, because the defendant conducted its business over the Internet, used e-mail regularly in its business, and encouraged parties to contact it via e-mail. *Id.*

Rule 4 does not require that a party attempt service of process by other methods enumerated in Rule 4(f) before petitioning the court for alternative relief under Rule 4(f)(3). *Rio Props.*, 284 F. 3d at 1014-15. As the *Rio Properties* Court explained, Rule 4(f) does not create a hierarchy of preferred methods of service of process. *Id.* at 1014. To the contrary, the plain

⁵ In the unlikely event a defendant for whom Plaintiff does not have an address was located in the United States, service would be governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e)(1), which provides for “following state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located”. Pa. R. Civ. Pro. 430 provides “[i]f service cannot be made under the applicable rule the plaintiff may move the court for a special order directing the method of service.” Thus, service by electronic means would also be sufficient in the event any Defendant is located in the United States. *See Power Corp. of Canada v. Power Financial*, No. 4:09-cv-0510, 2009 WL 982750 (M.D. Pa., April 13, 2009) (service by email is permitted under Rule 430 when defendant uses online service that shields owner’s identity).

language of the Rule requires only that service be directed by the court and not be prohibited by international agreement. There are no other limitations or requirements. *Id.* Alternative service under Rule 4(f)(3) is neither a “last resort” nor “extraordinary relief,” but is rather one means among several by which an international defendant may be served. *Id.* As such, this Court may allow Plaintiff to serve the defendants via electronic publication and/or e-mail.

Additionally, the Constitution itself does not mandate that service be effectuated in any particular way. Rather, Constitutional due process considerations require only that the method of service selected be “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.” *Brookshire Bros., Ltd. v. Chiquita Brands Int’l*, Case No. 05-CIV-21962, 2007 WL 1577771, at *1 (S.D. Fla. May 31, 2007) (quoting *Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust 10 Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)); *see also TracFone Wireless, Inc. v. Bitton*, 278 F.R.D. 687, 692 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 11, 2012); *Rio Props., Inc.*, 284 F.3d at 1016. Accordingly, federal courts have allowed a variety of alternative service methods, including service by e-mail and publication on a designated website, where a plaintiff demonstrates the likelihood that the proposed alternative method of service will notify a defendant of the pendency of the action. *See, e.g., Rio Props., Inc.*, 284 F.3d at 1017 (holding, “without hesitation,” that e-mail service of an online business defendant “was constitutionally acceptable”); *In re Int’l Telemedia Assocs.*, 245 B.R. 713, 721 (N.D. Ga. 2000) (“If any methods of communication can be reasonably calculated to provide a defendant with real notice, surely those communication channels utilized and preferred by the defendant himself must be included among them.”); *National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc. v. Does*, 584 F. Supp. 2d 824, 826 (W.D.N.C. 2008) (in “acknowledging the realities of the twenty-first

century and the information age, the Court determined that the most appropriate place for publication was [Plaintiff's Website].”).

Here, service on Defendants by e-mail and/or by publication on Plaintiffs' Website will satisfy due process by apprising them of the action and giving them the opportunity to answer Plaintiffs' claims. Based upon Plaintiffs' investigation, each Defendant has at least one form of electronic means of contact, demonstrating that this means of contact is not just effective, but the most reliable means of communicating with that Defendant, and consequently, the most reliable means of providing Defendants with notice of this action. (*Ference Dec.*, ¶¶ 7 - 8.) Moreover, service by publication on Plaintiffs' Website will be an additional source of reliability as Defendants will be able to see copies of the Complaint and all other documents in this matter electronically via their Internet browser. (*Id.*)

E-mail service on an online business defendant is appropriate and constitutionally acceptable in a case such as this when the plaintiff has proven that e-mail is the most effective means of providing the defendant notice of the action. *See Rio Props., Inc.*, 284 F.3d at 1017 (concluding “not only that service of process by e-mail was proper—that is, reasonably calculated to apprise [the defendant] of the pendency of the action and afford it an opportunity to respond— but in this case, it was the method of service most likely to reach [the defendant].”). *See also Popular Enters., LLC v. Webcom Media Group, Inc.*, 225 F.R.D. 560, 562 (E.D. Tenn. 2004) (“Under the facts and circumstances presented here, Rule 4(f)(3) clearly authorizes the court to direct service upon defendant by e-mail. The rule is expressly designed to provide courts with broad flexibility in tailoring methods of service to meet the needs of particularly difficult cases. Such flexibility necessarily includes the utilization of modern communication technologies to effect service when warranted by the facts”) (citation omitted). The *Rio*

Properties, Inc. and *Popular Enters., LLC* courts each determined e-mail service to be appropriate in part because, as in this case, the defendants conducted their businesses online, used e-mail regularly in their businesses, and encouraged parties to contact them via e-mail. *See Id.*

In cases that are factually similar to this one, a number of Courts have held that alternate forms of service pursuant to Rule 4(f)(3), such as e-mail service, are appropriate and may be the only means of effecting service of process “when faced with an international e-business scofflaw.” *Rio Properties, Inc.*, 284 F.3d at 1018; *see also Chanel, Inc. v. Zhixian*, Case No. 09-cv-02835, 2010 WL 1740695, at *3 (W.D. Tenn. March 17, 2010) (e-mail service “reasonably calculated to notify Defendants of the pendency of this action and provide him with an opportunity to present objections.”); *TracFone Wireless, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. at 693 (finding that service of process by e-mail was reasonably calculated to apprise the defendants of the action and give it an opportunity to respond); *Popular Enters., LLC*, 225 F.R.D. at 563 12 (same); *In re Int’l Telemedia Associates*, 245 B.R. at 722 (“A defendant should not be allowed to evade service by confining himself to modern technological methods of communication not specifically mentioned in the Federal Rules. Rule 4(f)(3) appears to be designed to prevent such gamesmanship by a party” (concluding e-mail and facsimile service to be appropriate)); *Chanel, Inc. v. Zhibing*, 2010 WL 1009981, at *4 (stating that e-mail service has the “greatest likelihood” of reaching e-commerce merchants and noting, “The federal judiciary’s own CM/ECF system alerts parties . . . by e-mail messages.” Alternate service via e-mail granted).⁶

⁶ Courts in the Southern District of New York are also very experienced in handling cases against merchants on Internet marketplaces and have consistently permitted alternate electronic service. *See, e.g. Intenze Products, Inc. v. 1586, et al.*, No. 18-cv-4611-RWS (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2018); *Allstar Marketing Group, LLC v. 158, et al.*, No. 18-cv-4101-GHW, Dkt. 22 (S.D.N.Y. May 17, 2018); *William Mark Corporation v. 1&cc, et al.*, No.

This Court has also authorized electronic service of process on merchants on Internet marketplaces in cases that are factually similar to the present case. *See, e.g., Rapid Slicer v. Buyspry*, No. 19-cv-249 (Order Authorizing Alternative Service entered on March 11, 2019) (Horan, J.); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Babymove*, No. 19-cv-166 (Order Authorizing Alternative Service entered on February 14, 2019) (Fischer, J.); and *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Artifacts_Selling*, No. 18-cv-1462 (Order Authorizing Alternative Service entered on November 2, 2018) (Fischer, J.). Plaintiffs submit that allowing e-mail service in the present case is appropriate and comports with constitutional notions of due process, particularly given

18-cv-3889-RA, Dkt. 18 (S.D.N.Y. May 2, 2018); *WOW Virtual Reality, Inc. v. Bienbest, et al.*, No. 18-cv-3305-VEC, Dkt. 9 (S.D.N.Y. April 16, 2018); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. abc789456, et al.*, No. 18-cv-2962-NRB, Dkt. 11 (S.D.N.Y. April 11, 2018); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. Aarhus, et al.*, No. 18-cv-2739-JGK, Dkt. 22 (S.D.N.Y. March 28, 2018); *Moose Toys Pty Ltd. et al., v. 963, et al.*, No. 18-cv-2187-VEC, Dkt. 16 (S.D.N.Y. April 2, 2018); *Off-White, LLC v. A445995685, et al.*, No. 18-cv-2009-LGS, Dkt. 5 (S.D.N.Y. March 27, 2018); *Spin Master Ltd. and Spin Master, Inc. v. 158, et al.*, No. 18-cv-1774-PAE, Dkt. 18 (Feb. 27, 2018); *JLM Couture, Inc. v. Aimibridal, et al.*, No. 18-cv-1565-JMF, Dkt. 18 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 21, 2018); *Spin Master Ltd. and Spin Master, Inc. v. Alisy, et al.*, No. 18-cv-543-PGG, Dkt. 16 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 22, 2018); *WowWee Group Limited, et al. v. Meirly, et al.*, No. 18-cv-706-AJN, Dkt. 11 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 26, 2018); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. Dongguan Shipai Loofah Sponge Commodity Factory, et al.*, No. 18-cv-901-PGG, Dkt. 20 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 1, 2018); *WowWee Group Limited, et al. v. A249345157, et al.*, No. 17-cv-9358-VEC, Dkt. 18 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 11, 2017); *HICKIES, Inc. v. Shop1668638 Store, et al.*, No. 17-cv-9101-ER, Dkt. 14 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 6, 2017); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. Dongguan Opete Yoga Wear Manufacturer Co., Ltd., et al.*, No. 17-cv-9099-JMF, Dkt. 19 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 27, 2017); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. Shenzhen City Poly Hui Foreign Trade Co., Ltd., et al.*, No. 17-cv-8704-JGK. (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2017); *Moose Toys Pty LTD et al. v. Guangzhou Junwei Trading Company d/b/a Backgroundshop et al.*, No. 17-cv-2561-LAK, Dkt. 12 (S.D.N.Y. May 11, 2017); *Rovio Entertainment Ltd. and Rovio Animation OY v. Angel Baby Factory d/b/a Angelbabyfactory et al.*, No. 17-cv-1840-KPF, Dkt. 11 (S.D.N.Y. March 27, 2017); *Ontel Products Corporation v. Airbrushpainting Makeup Store a/k/a Airbrushespainting et al.*, No. 17-cv-871-KBF, Dkt. 20 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 6, 2017); *Ideavillage Products Corp. v. Bling Boutique Store, et al.*, No. 16-cv-09039-KMW, Dkt. 9 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 21, 2016); *Gucci America, Inc., et al v. Alibaba Group Holding LTD, et al.*, No. 1:15-cv-03784-PKC (S.D.N.Y. June 23, 2015) (unpublished); *Chanel, Inc. v. Conklin Fashions, Inc.*, No. 3:15-cv-893-MAD/DEP, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 109886, at *10-13 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 14, 2015); *Belstaff Grp. SA v. Doe*, No. 15-cv-2242-PKC/MHD, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178124, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. June 18, 2015); *AW Licensing, LLC v. Bao*, No. 15-cv-1373, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177101, at *2-3 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 1, 2015); *Klipsch Grp., Inc. v. Big Box Store Ltd.*, No. 1:12-cv-06283-VSB, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153137, at *3-4 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2012); *True Religion Apparel, Inc. et al. v. Xiaokang Lee et al.*, No. 1:11-cv-08242-HB (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 15, 2011) (unpublished); *N. Face Apparel Corp. v. Fujian Sharing Imp. & Exp. Ltd. Co.*, No. 1:10-cv-1630-AKH, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158807 (S.D.N.Y. June 24, 2011).

Defendants' decision to conduct their illegal businesses using the Internet and utilizing e-mail as a primary means of communication.

Additionally, service of a defendant by publication on a designated website,⁷ such as Plaintiffs' Website, has been deemed appropriate service "so long as the proposed publication is '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.'" *National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc. v. Does*, 584 F. Supp. 2d 824, 826 (W.D.N.C. 2008) (quoting *Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 315-16 (1950)). In *National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing, Inc. v. Does*, the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina determined that the plaintiff could serve "Doe" defendants and apprise those defendants of a pending preliminary injunction hearing by publishing on the plaintiff's website. *Id.*

Accordingly, Plaintiffs have created a publication website on www.ferencelaw.com whereon copies of the Complaint, Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, this instant Motion, discovery, and other documents filed in this action will be posted. (*Ference Dec.*, ¶¶ 7 - 8). The address for Plaintiffs' Website will be included as part of service of process in this matter. (*Id.*) Posting the Summonses, Complaint, and Plaintiffs' *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order on Plaintiffs' Website will provide notice sufficient to meet the due process requirements for service of process and notice pursuant to

⁷ The Ference firm is prepared to provide notice via website publication if permitted by the Court. Through the email addresses received from the Third Party Service Providers and Financial Institutions, Ference would provide the named Defendants with a link to a web page accessible at www.ferencelaw.com that includes all of the relevant filings for the lawsuit. *See Ference Dec.*, ¶¶ 5 - 6.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4, apprise Defendants of the pendency of this action, and afford Defendants and any other interest parties an opportunity to present their answers and objection.

B. E-mail and Publication Service Are Not Prohibited by International Agreement.

Service via e-mail and website publication is not prohibited by international agreement. Based upon the information contained on Defendants' actual e-commerce marketplace stores, such as shipping information, and the data provided thereunder, Plaintiff has good cause to suspect some Defendants may be residing in the People's Republic of China ("China"), or other foreign jurisdictions, and/or redistribute products from sources in those locations. (*Ference Dec.* ¶ 7.) Both China and the United States are signatories to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extra-Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters (the "Hague Service Convention"). (*See Ference Dec.* ¶ 10 and Comp. Ex. 1 thereto, Hague Service Convention and list of signatory Members.) However, the Hague Service Convention does not preclude the Court from authorizing service of process via e-mail or website publication.

Alternative means of service, such as e-mail and website publication, are not prohibited by the Hague Service Convention where a signatory nation has not expressly objected to those means. *See Stat Med. Devices, Inc. v. HTL-Strefa, Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-20590-FAM, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122000 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2015) (noting that an objection to the alternative forms of service set forth in the Hague Convention is limited to the forms of service expressly objected to). Article 10 to the Hague Service Convention allows service of process through means other than a signatory's Central Authority, such as "postal channels" and "judicial officers," provided the State of destination does not object to those means. *See* Hague Convention, Art. 10, 20 U.S.T. 361 (1969). China has objected to the alternative means of service outlined in Article 10 of the Convention. (*Ference Dec.*, ¶ 10.) However, that objection is specifically limited to the

means of service enumerated in Article 10, and China has not expressly objected to service via e-mail or website publication. (*See id.* and Comp. Ex. 1 thereto, which includes a true and correct printout of China’s Declaration/Reservation/Notification in regards to the Hague Convention.) Because the declaration to the Hague Convention filed by China does not object to e-mail and website publication service, “a court acting under Rule 4(f)(3) remains free to order alternative means of service that are not specifically referenced in Article [10].” *Gurung v. Malhotra*, 279 F.R.D. 215, 219 (S.D.N.Y. 2011); *see also WhosHere, Inc. v. Orun*, Case No. 13-cv-00526-AJT, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22084, at *9 (E.D. Va. Feb. 20, 2014) (authorizing e-mail service, noting objection to means of service listed in Article 10 “is specifically limited to the enumerated means of service in Article 10.”). Moreover, an objection to the alternative means of service provided in Article 10 does not represent a per se objection to other forms of service, such e-mail or website publication. *See In re S. African Apartheid Litig.*, 643 F. Supp. 2d 423, 434, 437 (S.D.N.Y. 2009) (requiring express objection to alternative method of service by signatory nation to preclude that particular means of service). Consequently, China’s objections to the means of alternative service provided in Article 10 are no bar to court-directed service and do not prevent this Court from authorizing alternative service of process via e-mail or website publication. *See, e.g., Gurung*, 279 F.R.D. at 220 (approving service of process on foreign defendants via e-mail despite India’s objection to Article 10, stating that an “objection to service through postal channels does not amount to an express rejection of service via electronic mail.”); *Stat Med. Devices, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122000, at *8-9 (permitting service of process on foreign defendants via e-mail and substituted service on domestic counsel despite Poland’s objection to Article 10, noting “This Court and many other federal courts have permitted service by electronic mail and determined that an objection to . . . Article 10 of the Hague Convention . . . does

not equate to an express objection to service via electronic mail.”); *FTC v. PCCare247 Inc.*, Case No. 12-cv-7189-PAE, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31969, at *10 (S.D.N.Y. March 7, 2013) (authorizing service of process via e-mail and Facebook, explaining that “Numerous courts have held that service by email does not violate any international agreement where the objections of the recipient nation are limited to those means enumerated in Article 10.”); *WhosHere, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22084 (authorizing service of process on foreign defendants via e-mail despite Turkey’s objection to Article 10); *Richmond 17 Techs., Inc. v. Aumtech Bus. Solutions*, Case No. 11-CV-02460-LHK, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71269 (N.D. Cal. July 1, 2011) (“[N]umerous courts have authorized alternative service under Rule 4(f)(3) even where the Hague Convention applies. This is true even in cases involving countries that, like India, have objected to the alternative forms of service permitted under Article 10 of the Hague Convention.”).

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court grant the present motion and authorize service of the Summonses, the Complaint, discovery, and future filings in this matter upon each Defendant in this action:

(1) via e-mail by providing the address to Plaintiffs’ Website to Defendants via (i) the e-mail accounts provided by Defendants as part of the data related to their respective e-commerce stores, or (ii) via the e-commerce marketplace for each of the e-commerce stores; or

(2) via website publication by posting a copy of the Summonses, Complaint, Plaintiffs’ *Ex Parte* Application for Temporary Restraining Order, discovery, and all filings in this matter on Plaintiffs’ Website appearing on www.ferencelaw.com.

A Proposed Order granting this motion is submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 7, 2019

/s/ Stanley D. Ference III

Stanley D. Ference III

Pa. ID No. 59899

courts@ferencelaw.com

Brian Samuel Malkin

Pa. ID No. 70448

bmalkin@ferencelaw.com

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC

409 Broad Street

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143

(412) 741-8400 – Telephone

(412) 741-9292 – Facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Schedule “A”
Defendants With Store Name and Seller ID

Defendant No.	Defendant/Store Name	Seller ID
1	accessmall	58646d05dec9f84caa86e023
2	anticipate	5911303d4cb67623d7bc4cdb
3	chanzon	594e136cabea91780b592536
4	cherry women shop	582bd5b396db2604d0408093
5	cindydress	5922cbb7f4a3d44d77d19e18
6	corolissally	595d91c5b8bc5d54d0957d0a
7	crystalshining	58c695ec3f49637fe80cffbf
8	daisyshop	58dba57e3af68752ad25314b
9	DlawnPxansy	5b1931257752c84b77602de9
10	eternallystores	58edc33abef1c35ed33698d0
11	fujaiyanli	5b066676c721a914acf89cfc
12	goodsbuyhere	5a249f7a3c3aa252eb5c984e
13	happydeer	592e352f6fffc76b617d55ce
14	HFDS2017	58bd18c881cd4b5269dcb22b
15	Hicherry	56f8d9fe796b2f589b96a387
16	hongmei store	58ba65193cee5052a6754733
17	HQhuangL	58be263c7089df52945ec75a
18	JOLL	5d502e7a1527547edbad504d
19	LXUTHER MXARLOWE	5b17e9ee7b94e120fd0b7e86

Defendant No.	Defendant/Store Name	Seller ID
20	minsdeal	5a421f4c87c25b70c1122d9d
21	miongxianhghaoegf	5af3fad87824ca4f7a395aed
22	MYDC	589ac0cf396f39509689b133
23	purpledoo	59df4d1615da07122388aac0
24	quemeige	5b30511d337afb6439eb5ed6
25	REDLIU	5b91d07e6c62af49fb12f823
26	renxinstore	5a5d9e017276532645020439
27	sandlasho	59f9785f7276531984a7090f
28	SHXK	57280df53a698c7be7e3d3bc
29	uyuanludbi	5ae5283f18d9210d85a3701a
30	wangfujuanCBD	5850d604e7881151bd24940a
31	wonbubu	5a096b61e65033699e2c00e8
32	xiaoshengliwuhuanxi	5aa2a784823a3e3a6f7141cd
33	xijinjin123	58fdcf94d5a2c91117d583dd
34	xsevenboy	5aa3d823a6bf7a4fca85b76d
35	zhangyuting	58d7d0b8c430d85372ebd087
36	zhengruilan	58cfdeb99225295056b23305
37	zhongnianshuang	5b18d99d7752c82722602f2e
38	zhouzhongren	58e8aa549d883a158792495f
39	AZZD Store	4997257
40	appleooqw Store	4992463
41	City spray Store	5112048
42	Cookie's Outdoor Store	4413061

Defendant No.	Defendant/Store Name	Seller ID
43	Cute Pets Market Store	2654214
44	Eathevin Store	5046244
45	Esportes Store	4811026
46	Extreme crossing Store	5008317
47	Global Dropship 3 Store	4597029
48	Golden Retriever Outdoor Store	4468010
49	Good husband Store	5236011
50	Handclap Store	5042241
51	HandsomeBoy Store	5125103
52	HimanJie Store	2342222
53	HOMO dropship Store	5008322
54	KEEP Store	4500019
55	Lenzero Store	4808144
56	Libero Store	2703003
57	Loveliness Jewel Store	2956076
58	Magical Life Store	3248077
59	MAGORUI AR Store	4404113
60	Nine Suns Store	5107092
61	OuRui outdoor hunting Store	5129052
62	Outdoor Lifestyle Store	2662151
63	Outdoor Recreation Store	4460042
64	OutDooree K Store	4420112
65	OutdoorWorld Store	2916023

Defendant No.	Defendant/Store Name	Seller ID
66	Pawprint Store	2675065
67	pigpig Store	4576048
68	Pinellia outdoor Store	5005261
69	Respect Store	2947059
70	Romantic All House Store	5003134
71	Shop5236009 Store	5236009
72	SnugLan Store	5003133
73	To Keep Fit Store	3857035
74	topsell Store	4929028
75	WENY Store	4700002
76	ZJBeauty World Store	4801023
77	ZX Qianduoduo Store	3048016
78	brilliantly-illuminated	183964432945
79	flowersbud	153657848803
80	gift_select	283632713922
81	home-garden-us	233355365189
82	homme-fashion501	362776364840
83	jewellery.garden	362765984030
84	pqud064jxsaf-2	233362072602
85	technology-onsale	123948056857