

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

O.M. v. Calvary Chapel International Worship Center

O.M. · No. EA-25-2618 · Decided April 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland grants Calvary Chapel International Worship Center’s second motion to dismiss O.M.’s amended negligence claims arising from alleged childhood sexual abuse. The court holds that the amended complaint does not plausibly allege that Calvary Chapel had actual or constructive notice of the risk of abuse. The action is dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Erin Aslan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	April 23, 2026
DOCKET	EA-25-2618
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss the amended complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), or alternatively for summary judgment. The court declined to convert the motion to one for summary judgment and granted the motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true and draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, but does not accept legal conclusions as true. The complaint must contain sufficient factual content to state a claim that is plausible on its face. The court declined to consider materials outside the pleadings and therefore did not convert the motion into one for summary judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion
PARTIES	O.M. v. Calvary Chapel International Worship Center

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

pleadings

negligence

civil procedure

personal injury

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

negligence

personal injury

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint plausibly alleged that Calvary Chapel had actual or constructive notice of the personnel member's risk of sexually abusing a female child.
2. Whether the amended complaint plausibly stated negligence-based claims for negligent hiring, training, education, supervision, retention, premises liability, and failure to report or warn.
3. Whether the court should convert Calvary Chapel's alternative motion for summary judgment into a motion for summary judgment by considering evidence outside the pleadings.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to consider materials outside the pleadings and therefore treated the pending motion as a motion to dismiss rather than converting it into a motion for summary judgment.
2. The amended complaint did not plausibly allege that Calvary Chapel knew or should have known that the personnel member posed a risk of sexually abusing a female child.
3. Conclusory assertions that Calvary Chapel had actual or constructive knowledge of the abuse were insufficient to state a plausible claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must have “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.”” (II.A)

“It is simply too far of an inferential leap to conclude that alleged actions towards an adult of the opposite sex such as “regularly rub[bing] her body against the bodies of male church members” or “aggressively pursu[ing] male church members” would have provided actual or constructive notice that this individual had the potential to sexually abuse a female child.” (II.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

O.M. alleged that, when she was approximately ten years old in or around 1971, a Calvary Chapel personnel member sexually abused her on four or five occasions over approximately twelve months, both at the church and at the personnel member's home. She alleged that the personnel member had engaged in inappropriate conduct toward adult male church members, made sexual remarks, and had a reputation for manipulative and illegal behavior, which allegedly was known to church staff and other congregants. O.M. also alleged that her personality changed and that she stopped attending church activities to avoid being alone with the personnel member. She claimed emotional, psychological, and physical harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

O.M. filed negligence claims in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, Maryland, under the Maryland Child Victims Act of 2023. Calvary Chapel removed the action to federal court based on diversity jurisdiction. The court previously granted Calvary Chapel's first motion to dismiss, dismissed one count with prejudice, and allowed O.M. to amend four other counts. After O.M. filed an amended complaint, Calvary Chapel renewed its motion to dismiss or alternatively sought summary judgment. The court dismissed the amended complaint with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Kolon Indus., Inc., 637 F.3d 435, 440 (4th Cir. 2011)
- O.M. v. Calvary Chapel Int'l Worship Ctr., Civil Action No. EA-25-2618, 2025 WL 3280293, at *2-4 (D. Md. Nov. 25, 2025)
- Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 243 (4th Cir. 1999)
- Doe v. Anne Arundel Cnty., Civil Action No. JRR-23-3451, 2025 WL 675059, at *4 (D. Md. Mar. 3, 2025)
- Sammons v. McCarthy, 606 F. Supp. 3d 165, 194 (D. Md. 2022)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- A Society Without a Name v. Virginia, 655 F.3d 342, 346 (4th Cir. 2011)
- Doe 1 v. World Wrestling Entertainment, 811 F. Supp. 3d 706, 725 (D. Md. 2025)
- C.M. v. Adams & Assocs., Inc., Civil Action No. JMC-25-2684, 2025 WL 3484044, at *6 (D. Md. Dec. 4, 2025)
- J.D. v. Baltimore City Bd. of Sch. Commissioners, Civil Action No. JMC-25-1125, 2025 WL 2653149, at *8 (D. Md. Sept. 16, 2025)
- Doe v. United States, 381 F. Supp. 3d 573, 596 (M.D.N.C. 2019)
- Pizarro Orta v. Creekstone Landscaping & Excavating, LLC, Civil Action No. EA-23-1954, 2024 WL 3555093, at *5 (D. Md. July 25, 2024)
- Greene v. Mott, Civil Action No. JRR-24-3310, 2025 WL 2208152, at *4 (D. Md. Aug. 4, 2025)
- Great N. Ins. Co. v. Recall Total Info. Mgmt., Inc., Civil Action No. AW-13-1829, 2013 WL 6804745, at *3 (D. Md. Dec. 19, 2013)