Document 205

Filed 02/09/2009

Page 1 of 3

ase 2:06-cv-01110-RLH-GWF

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff's discovery requests. In its November 21st Order, the Court instructed that Defendants' corporate officers, rather than simply counsel for the Defendants, appear at the hearing. The Court also instructed 1st Technology to serve Defendants with a copy of the Order pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In December 2008, 1st Technology attempted to serve Defendants through their designated representative who, according to 1st Technology's records, was located in Costa Rica. 1st Technology was unable to effectuate service on Defendants because the building where the designated representative was allegedly located had been abandoned. On January 9, 2009, Plaintiff served Foley & Lardner, counsel for Defendants, with a copy of the Order. 1st Technology now brings this Motion for an Order Permitting Alternative Service.

## DISCUSSION

1st Technology argues that, given its inability to serve Defendants directly, its service on Foley & Lardner is adequate. The Court agrees and grants Plaintiff's Motion. Trial courts have discretion to permit "a wide variety of alternative methods of service including publication, ordinary mail, mail to defendant's last known address, delivery to defendant's attorney, telex, and . . . email." Rio Props., Inc. v. Rio Int'l Interlink, 284 F.3d 1007, 1016 (9th Cir. 2002). In light of 1st Technology's attempt to serve Defendants, as well as the fact that Defendants are "elusive international defendant[s]," the Court deems Plaintiff's service on Foley & Lardner to be effective. See id. The Court comes to this conclusion in order to continue with the hearing scheduled on March 5, 2009, and in order to see that this litigation is properly and timely resolved.

Although the Court grants Plaintiff's Motion, it adds an additional requirement: Plaintiff is ordered to serve Defendants by publication as well.

There has been some confusion among the parties regarding whether the Court requires 1st Technology to serve Defendants' corporate officers. The Court does not require that such officers be served. The Court requires only that the defendant parties—in this case—various

1	business entities, be served notice of the March 2009 hearing. Nonetheless, as noted in its
2	previous Order (#190), defense counsel may not come to the hearing alone. Defendants' corporate
3	officers, as representatives of the Defendant companies, must appear before the Court on March 5,
4	2009, to show cause as to why they should not be held in civil contempt.
5	CONCLUSION
6	Accordingly, and for good cause appearing,
7	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that 1st Technology's service of Foley & Lardner on
8	January 9, 2009, is sufficient alternative service under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil
9	Procedure.
10	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that 1st Technology serve Defendants by publication.
11	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the March 5, 2009, hearing will occur as
12	scheduled. Defendants' corporate officers are ordered to appear at the hearing.
13	
14	Dated: February 9, 2009.
15	2 1 Hook
16	ROGER'L. HUNT
17	Chief United States District Judge
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	