

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Amelia Cazares v. Acro International Inc.

Cazares · No. 25-cv-0537-bhl · Decided January 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin granted Amelia Cazares’s motion for default judgment against Acro International Inc. on her claim that the defendant’s website violated Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The court ordered a permanent injunction requiring Acro International to bring its website into ADA compliance within 180 days, while denying additional declaratory and injunctive relief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brett H. Ludwig
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	January 7, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-0537-bhl
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for default judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) after Defendant failed to answer or otherwise appear. The court granted the motion in part and denied it in part.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a motion for default judgment, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations relating to liability as true but must determine whether those allegations establish legal liability. The court separately evaluates the appropriateness and scope of requested injunctive relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- default judgment
- default
- injunctions
- public accommodations discrimination
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- disability discrimination
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the well-pleaded allegations admitted by Defendant's default establish liability under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
2. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendant to bring its website into compliance with the ADA.
3. Whether Plaintiff is entitled to additional specific injunctive relief, declaratory relief, or reservation of jurisdiction over attorneys' fees and costs.

HOLDINGS

1. The admitted well-pleaded allegations establish that Acro International violated Title III of the ADA by operating an inaccessible website that denied Cazares equal access to goods and services because of her disability.
2. Cazares is entitled to a permanent injunction requiring Acro International to bring its website into compliance with the ADA within 180 days.
3. The injunction must be limited to requiring Acro International to bring its website into compliance with the ADA; the court declined to order the additional specific measures requested by Cazares.
4. Declaratory relief stating that Acro International's website violated Title III is inappropriate because Cazares seeks a declaration concerning past discrimination.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A default judgment establishes, as a matter of law, that defendants are liable to plaintiff on each cause of action alleged in the complaint.”

“Upon default, the well-pled allegations of the complaint relating to liability are taken as true, but those relating to the amount of damages suffered ordinarily are not.”

“The Court is required to “tailor injunctive relief to the scope of the violation found.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Amelia Cazares is legally blind and uses screen-reading software to navigate the internet. Acro International operates a public retail website selling goods including traditional Indian sweets, dry fruits, clothing, and spices. Cazares attempted to purchase spices but could not independently complete the transaction because the website was incompatible with her accessibility tools.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Acro International accepted service on May 7, 2025, but did not answer or appear. The Clerk entered default under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a) on September 10, 2025. Cazares then moved for default judgment, which the court granted as to liability and permanent injunctive relief, while denying additional declaratory and specific injunctive relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wehrs v. Wells, 688 F.3d 886, 892 (7th Cir.)
- e360 Insight v. Spamhaus Project, 500 F.3d 594, 602, 604–05 (7th Cir.)
- United States v. Di Mucci, 879 F.2d 1488, 1497 (7th Cir.)
- Scherr v. Marriott Int'l, Inc., 703 F.3d 1069, 1075–76 (7th Cir.)
- Access Living of Metro. Chi. v. Uber Techs., Inc., 958 F.3d 604, 609 (7th Cir.)
- Morgan v. Joint Admin. Bd., 268 F.3d 456, 459 (7th Cir. 2001)
- LAJIM, LLC v. Gen. Elec. Co., 917 F.3d 933, 944 (7th Cir.)
- eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, LLC, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)
- PGA Tour, Inc. v. Martin, 532 U.S. 661, 675 (2001)
- Nat'l Org. for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler, 396 F.3d 807, 817 (7th Cir.), rev'd on other grounds, 547 U.S. 9 (2006)
- McCabe v. Markwins Beauty Products Inc., No. 24-cv-1004-bhl, 2025 WL 1555372, at *3 (E.D. Wis. June 2, 2025)
- Wright v. Thread Experiment, LLC, No. 19-cv-1423-SEB-TAB, 2021 WL 243604, at *5 n.4 (S.D. Ind. Jan. 22, 2021)