

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DR. KASIPPILLAI MANOHARAN, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PERCY MAHENDRA RAJAPAKSA,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 11-235 (CKK)

ORDER

(October 13, 2011)

On October 1, 2011, Plaintiffs filed [6] Motion for Service by Publication or Alternative Means. Having unsuccessfully served Defendant with process via the Hague Convention, mail, and in person, Plaintiffs now seek to serve Defendant with process by one of a number of means, including publication, Twitter, Facebook, and email.

Having evaded service in person and refusing service under the international agreement established for the purpose of service of process on international defendants, “it is not reasonably possible or practicable to give more adequate warning” to Defendant than service by publication. *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 317 (1950). Assuming that Defendant does not already have actual notice of the action based on Plaintiffs’ attempts to serve process under the Hague Convention, publication in newspapers of general circulation six days per week for four weeks is reasonably calculated to apprise Defendant of the lawsuit and afford him an opportunity to object.

It is, this 13th day of October 2011, hereby

ORDERED that pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3), Plaintiffs’ [6] Motion for Service by

