

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

LOGARO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

BAMBOOHART, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.
1:26-CV-03620-JPB

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Electronic Service of Process [Doc. 6]. This Court finds as follows:

APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(h), corporations may be served outside of the United States in any manner prescribed by Rule 4(f) for serving an individual, except personal service. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(h)(2). Rule 4(f), in turn, provides that an individual outside the United States may be served:

- (1) by any internationally agreed means of service that is reasonably calculated to give notice, such as those authorized by the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents;
- (2) if there is no internationally agreed means, or if an international agreement allows but does not specify other means, by a method that is reasonably calculated to give notice:

- (A) as prescribed by the foreign country's law for service in that country in an action in its courts of general jurisdiction;
- (B) as the foreign authority directs in response to a letter rogatory or letter of request; or
- (C) unless prohibited by the foreign country's law, by:
 - . . . using any form of mail that the clerk addresses and sends to the individual and that requires a signed receipt; or
- (3) by other means not prohibited by international agreement, as the court orders.

A plaintiff is not required to serve a person or corporation outside of the United States pursuant to the provisions of the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents “where the address of the person to be served with the document is not known.” Hague Convention on Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters, art. 1, Nov. 15, 1965, 20 U.S.T. 361, 658 U.N.T.S. 163.

Rule 4(f)(3) permits alternative methods of service so long as those methods are not prohibited by international agreement and are approved by the Court. Brookshire Bros., Ltd. v. Chiquita Brands Int’l, No. 05-CIV-21962, 2007 WL 1577771, at *2 (S.D. Fla. May 31, 2007); Rio Props., Inc., v. Rio Int’l Interlink, 284 F.3d 1007, 1014 (9th Cir. 2002). Additionally, any alternative method of service must comport with due process of law. “Due process requires that individuals whose property interests are at risk due to government action receive

notice and an opportunity to be heard.” Thomas v. United States, 681 F. App’x 787, 790 (11th Cir. 2017). “The notice must 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.’” Id. (quoting Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Tr. Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)).

ANALYSIS

Defendants are individuals, corporations or associations located outside the United States, most likely in China. Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged that Defendants are likely engaged in the business of selling counterfeit and infringing products through various e-commerce platforms (“Marketplaces”), including to customers in the United States. Defendants operate online storefronts on one or more of these Marketplaces. Defendants do not provide accurate addresses on their storefronts, nor are accurate addresses readily available by reviewing the Marketplaces. The primary means of communicating with Defendants is through electronic mail.

Because Defendants’ physical addresses are not known or readily ascertainable, Plaintiffs are not required to serve Defendants pursuant to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents. Additionally, consistent with the findings of numerous other courts, this Court

finds that service on Defendants by electronic mail is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Defendants of the pendency of this action and afford them an opportunity to appear and be heard. In re Int'l Telemedia Assocs., Inc., 245 B.R. 713, 719–22 (Bankr. N.D. Ga. 2000); Rio Props., 284 F.3d at 1017; Popular Enters., LLC v. Webcom Media Grp., Inc., 225 F.R.D. 560, 562 (E.D. Tenn. 2004).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons explained above, Plaintiff's Motion for Electronic Service of Process [Doc. 6] is hereby **GRANTED**. Pursuant to Rule 4(f)(3), Plaintiff is authorized to provide notice of these proceedings to Defendants by electronically publishing a link to the Complaint, this Order and other relevant documents on a website and by sending an email with a link to a website and the service documents as attachments to an email address for each defendant.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of August, 2026.



J. P. BOULEE
United States District Judge