

SECOND REGULAR SESSION
HOUSE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR
SENATE SUBSTITUTE FOR
SENATE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR
SENATE BILL NOS. 907, 1154 & 1272
103RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY

5627H.09C

JOSEPH ENGLER, Chief Clerk

AN ACT

To amend chapter 537, RSMo, by adding thereto one new section relating to abusive website access litigation.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the state of Missouri, as follows:

Section A. Chapter 537, RSMo, is amended by adding thereto one new section, to be
2 known as section 537.1250, to read as follows:

**537.1250. 1. (1) This section shall be known and may be cited as the "Act
2 Against Abusive Website Access Litigation".**

3 **(2) As used in this section, the following terms mean:**

4 **(a) "Access violation", any allegation that a website fails to comply with the
5 accessibility requirements of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act or under state
6 law;**

7 **(b) "Resident of this state", any individual residing in Missouri; any entity that
8 has registered with the Missouri secretary of state's office; or the state of Missouri or
9 any political subdivision thereof, including all boards, commissions, agencies,
10 institutions, authorities, and bodies politic and corporate of the state created by or in
11 accordance with state law or regulations.**

12 **2. (1) The attorney general under section 507.070 on behalf of a class of
13 residents of this state who are subject to litigation that alleges any website access
14 violation, or any resident of this state who is subject to litigation that alleges any website
15 access violation, may file a civil action in any court of competent jurisdiction within this
16 state against the party, attorney, or law firm that initiated such litigation for a**

EXPLANATION — Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill is not enacted and is intended to be omitted from the law. Matter in **bold-face** type in the above bill is proposed language.

17 **determination as to whether such litigation alleging a website access violation is abusive**
18 **litigation.**

19 **(2) In determining whether any litigation that alleges any website access**
20 **violation constitutes abusive litigation, the court shall consider the totality of the**
21 **circumstances to determine if the primary purpose of the litigation that alleges a website**
22 **access violation is obtaining a payment from a defendant due to the costs of defending**
23 **the action in court. For the purposes of making this determination, the court may assess**
24 **the following factors and any other factors the court deems relevant for assessing:**

25 **(a) Whether the same plaintiff, attorney, or law firm has filed a high number of**
26 **substantially similar lawsuits without meaningful efforts to resolve or improve**
27 **accessibility;**

28 **(b) Whether the plaintiff provided the defendant with reasonable notice and an**
29 **opportunity to correct the alleged barrier prior to filing suit;**

30 **(c) Any history of sanctions or findings of bad faith against the plaintiff or**
31 **counsel;**

32 **(d) The nature of settlement discussions and the reasonableness of settlement**
33 **offers and refusals to settle. The application of such settlement information shall be**
34 **used only as provided by this section and shall not otherwise alter the rules of evidence**
35 **applicable to such court; and**

36 **(e) Whether any factors under Missouri supreme court rule 55.03(b) exist in the**
37 **litigation and whether sanctions are appropriate under Missouri supreme court rule**
38 **55.03(c).**

39 **(3) A defendant who receives written notice of an alleged website access violation**
40 **and in good faith initiates substantial steps to correct it within ninety days shall have a**
41 **rebuttable presumption that any subsequent claim for a website access violation is**
42 **abusive. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit a defendant from filing a**
43 **motion to dismiss or from notifying the plaintiff, prior to the expiration of the ninety-**
44 **day period, that the alleged access violation has been corrected in good faith. There**
45 **shall not be a rebuttable presumption that such litigation is abusive litigation if the**
46 **alleged website access violation is not corrected, as determined by the court, within**
47 **ninety days after being provided written notice or being served a petition or complaint**
48 **with sufficient detail to identify and correct the alleged access violation. The trier of fact**
49 **shall not determine whether such litigation is abusive litigation until after such ninety-**
50 **day period expires or the alleged access violation is corrected, as determined by the**
51 **court, whichever occurs first. This subdivision shall be known and may be cited as the**
52 **"Safe Harbor Provision".**

53 **3. The attorney general may intervene or bring an action on behalf of Missouri**
54 **residents or entities that are the targets of abusive website access litigation as defined in**
55 **this section. The attorney general may also issue guidance or determinations clarifying**
56 **when litigation practices are deemed abusive, but such determinations shall not**
57 **preclude legitimate accessibility enforcement actions.**

58 **4. If the trier of fact determines that an initiator of an action under subsection 2**
59 **of this section is a defendant in abusive litigation, the court may award reasonable**
60 **attorney's fees and costs in bringing the action under subsection 2 of this section as well**
61 **as defending against the abusive litigation to be paid by the party bringing the abusive**
62 **litigation. In addition, the court may award punitive damages or sanctions not to exceed**
63 **three times the amount of attorney's fees awarded by the court.**

64 **5. At the conclusion of the litigation alleging a website access violation, the court**
65 **shall review any determination that such litigation is abusive and any award of**
66 **attorney's fees under the Missouri supreme court rules of professional conduct to**
67 **determine the reasonableness of the award before issuing a judgment.**

68 **6. If the United States Department of Justice issues standards concerning**
69 **website accessibility under Title III of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act, 42**
70 **U.S.C. Sections 12181 to 12189, the attorney general shall notify the revisor of statutes**
71 **that such standards have been issued. Upon receipt of such notification by the revisor,**
72 **the provisions of this section shall expire with respect to any entity that has registered**
73 **with the Missouri secretary of state's office or the state of Missouri or any political**
74 **subdivision thereof, including all boards, commissions, agencies, institutions,**
75 **authorities, and bodies politic and corporate of the state created by or in accordance**
76 **with state law or regulations.**

77 **7. This section shall apply to litigation pending on August 28, 2026. The**
78 **provisions of subdivision (3) of subsection 2 of this section shall apply to any defendant**
79 **in any pending litigation on August 28, 2026, that has complied with the requirements of**
80 **subdivision (3) of subsection 2 of this section prior to August 28, 2026, or that is within**
81 **the ninety-day correction period after August 28, 2026.**

✓