

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Elizabeth Ramos v. OpenAI, Inc., et al.

Ramos · No. 6:25-cv-03281-MDH · Decided June 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri grants OpenAI’s motion to dismiss Elizabeth Ramos’s Second Amended Complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 12(b)(6). The court concludes that Ramos’s claims for trade-secret misappropriation, CFAA violations, breach of contract, unjust enrichment, Missouri Merchandising Practices Act violations, emotional distress, intrusion upon seclusion, and Servicemembers Civil Relief Act violations are inadequately pleaded or legally unavailable. The case is dismissed with prejudice, and Ramos’s pending pro se motions are denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Douglas Harpool
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, Southern Division
DECIDED	June 2, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-03281-MDH
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff's pro se Second Amended Complaint was dismissed on Defendant OpenAI's Rule 12(b)(6) motion. Plaintiff's motion to transfer venue and motion for preservation were denied as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, views the record in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, and determines whether the complaint contains sufficient factual matter to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. Conclusory assertions, naked assertions without factual enhancement, and threadbare recitals of claim elements are insufficient. The Court also liberally construed Plaintiff's pro se pleading.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; order from a federal district court with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Elizabeth Ramos v. OpenAI, Inc., et al.

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#)
[pleadings](#)
[civil procedure](#)
[trade secrets](#)
[contracts](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)
[intellectual property](#)
[contracts](#)
[torts](#)
[consumer protection](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Second Amended Complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 by providing a short and plain, comprehensible statement of facts supporting Plaintiff's claims.
2. Whether the Second Amended Complaint plausibly stated a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).
3. Whether Plaintiff plausibly pleaded trade-secret misappropriation under federal or Missouri law.
4. Whether Plaintiff plausibly pleaded a Computer Fraud and Abuse Act claim based on information voluntarily entered into ChatGPT.
5. Whether Plaintiff plausibly pleaded breach of contract, unjust enrichment, Missouri Merchandising Practices Act violations, intentional or negligent infliction of emotional distress, intrusion upon seclusion, or a Servicemembers Civil Relief Act violation.

HOLDINGS

1. The Second Amended Complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 because it consisted of conclusory allegations, unclear jargon, and insufficient factual support for the nine asserted causes of action.
2. The Second Amended Complaint failed to state a plausible claim for relief under Rule 12(b)(6), and dismissal of the complaint was warranted.
3. Plaintiff failed to state a trade-secret misappropriation claim under the Defend Trade Secrets Act or Missouri law because she did not adequately allege a protectable trade secret, misappropriation, or damages.
4. Plaintiff failed to state a claim under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act because she alleged that she voluntarily entered the information into ChatGPT and did not allege unauthorized access to her computer.
5. Plaintiff failed to plead sufficient facts supporting Counts III through IX, including the required elements of each claim, and those claims were dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must ‘contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” (Standard of Review)

“Plaintiff fails to provide factual support or allegations that would support her nine separate causes of action.” (Discussion, Rule 8)

“Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint fails to state a claim and Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that she used ChatGPT to develop an emotional-interaction model and an architectural blueprint, which she called the Blueprint for Our-Omni Verse. She claimed that OpenAI extracted or misappropriated the material through her voluntary interactions with ChatGPT, misrepresented the tool’s safety and therapeutic value, and commercially exploited the alleged work. Her Second Amended Complaint asserted claims for trade-secret misappropriation, CFAA violations, breach of contract, unjust enrichment, Missouri Merchandising Practices Act violations, intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, intrusion upon seclusion, and violation of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. The Court found the allegations conclusory, unclear, and lacking specific facts identifying the alleged trade secrets, the alleged misconduct, or the elements of the asserted claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed suit on August 13, 2025. After OpenAI moved to dismiss the original complaint and then the First Amended Complaint, the Court granted Plaintiff leave to file a Second Amended Complaint but warned that no further amendments would be allowed absent extraordinary circumstances. OpenAI moved to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint, and the Court granted the motion, dismissed the action with prejudice, and denied Plaintiff’s other pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Co., 119 Cal. App. 3d 757 (1981)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Schriener v. Quicken Loans, Inc., 774 F.3d 442, 444 (8th Cir. 2014)
- Christopherson v. Bushner, 33 F.4th 495, 499 (8th Cir. 2022)
- Trinidad v. OpenAI Inc., No. 25-cv-06328-JST, 2026 WL 21791, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2026)
- Bullens v. OpenAI, L.P., No. 1:25-cv-01024TWP-MJD, 2025 WL 2097419, at *2 (S.D. Ind. July 25, 2025)
- Provisur Techs., Inc. v. Weber, Inc., No. 21-cv-06113-SRB, 2023 WL 11986967, at *2 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 13, 2023)

- InfoDeli, LLC v. W. Robidoux, Inc., No. 4:15-CV-00364-BCW, 2020 WL 1852501, at *10 (W.D. Mo. Feb. 28, 2020)
- InfoDeli, 2016 WL 6921623, at *4
- Friend v. Aegis Commc'ns Grp., LLC, No. 3:13-cv-05054-MDH, 2014 WL 4421579, at *8 (W.D. Mo. Sept. 9, 2014)
- Miller v. Wackenhut Servs., Inc., 808 F. Supp. 697, 700–01 (W.D. Mo. 1992)
- Kan. City Laser, Inc. v. MCI Telecomms. Corp., 252 F. App'x 100, 104 (8th Cir. 2007)
- McMahan v. Hawkeye Hotel, Inc., No. 20-00945-CV-W-GAF, 2022 WL 1736838, at *2, *5–6 (W.D. Mo. Jan. 19, 2022)
- Goldblatt v. Herron, No. 4:10-CV-1183-DGK, 2011 WL 3584794, at *1 (W.D. Mo. Aug. 15, 2011)
- Couzens v. Donohue, 854 F.3d 508, 518 (8th Cir. 2017)
- T.R. v. Clay-Platte Fam. Med., P.C., No. 24-cv-00704-SRB, 2025 WL 3143638, at *7 (W.D. Mo. Nov. 3, 2025)