

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

**Amazon.com Inc., Amazon.com Services LLC, and RB Health (US)
LLC v. Sehrish Gul, Muhammad Rehbar, Prasenjit Gope, Ikhtisham
Ul Haq, Rida Arif, Zahid Ur Rehman, Zamrud Khan, Adnan Faraz,
Onthego Gopech LLC, Khateen LLC, PR-Ecommerce LLC,
RZGlobe LLC, A ShoppingEmbassy LLC, SkyTwilight LLC, and
Does 1-10**

Amazon.com Inc. v. Gul · No. 2:25-cv-00371-KKE-BAT · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington denied without prejudice Plaintiffs’ motion for alternative service by email on individual defendants in an action alleging counterfeit sales of Neuriva-branded health supplements. The Court held that although email service was permissible under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f), Plaintiffs had not shown that the proposed email addresses were reasonably calculated to provide actual notice. Plaintiffs were ordered by April 6, 2026, to show proof of service, file a renewed motion, or show cause why the individual defendants should not be dismissed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brian A. Tsuchida
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00371-KKE-BAT
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for alternative service by email on certain individual defendants after allegedly being unable to discover valid physical addresses. The court denied the motion without prejudice and ordered plaintiffs to provide proof of service, file a renewed motion, or show cause why the defendants should not be dismissed.

STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court evaluated whether the proposed alternative service satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3) and constitutional due process.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Amazon.com Inc., Amazon.com Services LLC, RB Health (US) LLC v. Sehrish Gul, Muhammad Rehbar, Prasenjit Gope, Ikhtisham Ul Haq, Rida Arif, Zahid Ur Rehman, Zamrud Khan, Adnan Faraz, Onthego Gopech LLC, Khateen LLC, PR-Ecommerce LLC, RZGlobe LLC, A ShoppingEmbassy LLC, SkyTwilight LLC, Does 1-10

TOPICS

service of process civil procedure trademark infringement consumer protection commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure trademark infringement consumer protection commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether service by email was authorized under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3).
2. Whether the proposed email service was reasonably calculated under constitutional due process to apprise the defendants of the action and provide an opportunity to respond.
3. Whether plaintiffs had shown sufficient grounds for the court to authorize alternative service by email.

HOLDINGS

1. Rule 4(f)(3) permits a court to order service by any means not prohibited by international agreement and consistent with due process. Because the proposed email service was not prohibited by an applicable international agreement on the facts presented, plaintiffs satisfied the Rule 4(f) component of the analysis.
2. Plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that service at the proposed email addresses was reasonably calculated to provide the defendants with notice of the lawsuit; consequently, the court denied the motion for alternative service without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In other words, under Rule 4(f)(3), the Court may order service by any means not prohibited by international agreement and consistent with due process.” (at 3)

“The Court cannot conclude email service is reasonably calculated to provide notice to Defendants.” (at 4)

“Plaintiffs have thus failed to meet their burden to demonstrate that email service will likely provide Defendants with notice of this lawsuit.” (at 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged that defendants sold counterfeit health supplements branded as RB Health's Neuriva products through Amazon.com. They alleged that Sehrish Gul and Muhammad Rehbar recruited other defendants to create LLCs and Amazon selling accounts, which were then used to sell the allegedly counterfeit products. Plaintiffs sought to serve the individual defendants by email because their physical addresses could not be verified, relying primarily on email addresses associated with Amazon selling accounts and one Gmail address connected to an intercepted communication.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed claims arising from alleged sales of counterfeit Neuriva-branded supplements through Amazon.com. They sought authorization under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(f)(3) to serve certain defendants by email. The motion was referred to the magistrate judge, who concluded that plaintiffs had not shown that the proposed email addresses were reasonably calculated to provide actual notice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. Plaintiffs were ordered by April 6, 2026, to show proof of service, submit a new motion for alternative service, or show cause why the affected defendants should not be dismissed.

CASES CITED

- Rio Props., Inc. v. Rio Int'l Interlink, 284 F.3d 1007, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Amazon.com, Inc. v. Bamb Awns, 2023 WL 2837076, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 7, 2023)
- Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Tr. Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950)