

The Cost of Getting Accessibility Wrong: Legal, Financial, and Operational Impacts and Solutions

Splash Box® Marketing, LLC

splashbox.com | accessalttext.com

April 2026

Executive Summary

The Internet is more complex and image- and video-rich than we ever could have imagined ten or twenty years ago. With that complexity, however, comes certain expectations for access as well as risk when those expectations are not met. Between the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, and various local and state regulations, digital accessibility is a requirement in today's modern world. Unfortunately, not everyone takes these requirements seriously. According to WebAIM, there were 56,114,377 distinct accessibility errors across the top million websites in 2025.¹ That is about 56 errors on each page. There is real risk associated with this number of errors and subsequent non-compliance with accessibility standards. The federal government has clearly spoken on digital accessibility and the standards they expect organizations to follow. Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta said that the government will, "continue to use every tool that we have, including our enforcement authority, to ensure that people disabilities are not treated like second class citizens when it comes to online services."²

Section 1: Legal Requirements for Digital Accessibility

Federal and state governments mandate that public facilities must be accessible to everyone and cannot discriminate against people with disabilities. This means that federal buildings like courthouses, libraries, schools, and more must have accommodations like curb cuts, wheelchair ramps, handicap parking spots, and more. A 23-story building with an elevator that's out of order is a clear violation. But physical accessibility isn't the limit. Digital accessibility is an equally important yet lesser-known mandate, and yet, there are multiple key laws that require equal access to the Internet for those who are disabled.

I. The Americans with Disabilities Act

In 1990, the ADA was signed into law to prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities in employment, government services, and places of public accommodation.³ The legal act didn't specifically address the Internet because it was rarely in use for these services in 1990. However, throughout the nineties, websites would proliferate. In 1996, the United States Department of Justice clarified that websites are indeed public accommodations under the ADA.⁴ This means that there is a legal obligation to ensure digital assets are accessible.

II. Title II of the ADA

In April of 2024, the United States Department of Justice released a landmark final rule,⁵ that revised Title II of the ADA. It formally codified WCAG 2.1 AA as the mandatory standard for all state and local government websites, as well as mobile apps, digital documents, e-filing platforms, online payment systems, permit applications, social media posts, and essentially any public-facing government content. When you hear “government,” you probably think about your county courthouse, politicians, and city governance. While those are included in the Title II revision, it also includes K-12 school districts, public colleges and universities, libraries, voting centers, police and fire departments, public parks, public hospitals, and third-party vendors and contractors.⁶

III. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act

Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 is another piece of legislation that regulates disability rights. It was amended in 1998 to require federal agencies to make their electronic and information technology (EIT) accessible to those who have disabilities (i.e., blind and deaf people who use assistive technology like screen readers).⁷ The goal is to ensure that people with disabilities – including both employees and members of the public – have the same access to governmental information and services that people without disabilities have. Therefore, Section 508 standards apply in the development, procurement, maintenance, and use of EIT. This legislation also applies to any organization that utilizes federal funding, like health plans, the postal service, government contractors or vendors, and so much more.

IV. WCAG

The Web Content Accessibility Guidelines, often referred to as WCAG, were developed by the World Wide Web Consortium’s Web Accessibility Initiative. Now known as the Accessibility Guidelines Working Group, the WCAG provides a specific, measurable technical standard by which accessibility is quantifiable. WCAG 1.0 was released in 1991, with 2.0 coming a decade after in 2008 and 2.2 in 2023. WCAG 3.0 is currently in development. These standards provide specific criteria for making digital content accessible. The guidelines organize accessibility into four core principles: perceivable, operable, understandable, and robust. Additionally, there are three testable “success criteria,”⁸ which are levels A, AA, and AAA. These levels are what determine whether your content conforms to the

WCAG standards. Most major legislation that governs accessibility requires conformance to WCAG standards, including the ADA, Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, the European Accessibility Act (EAA), the Accessible Canada Act, and more.

Taken together, the ADA, Section 508, and the WCAG form an interlocking legal and technical framework that makes digital accessibility not just a best practice, but a binding obligation. The upcoming ADA Title II deadline signals that regulatory expectations will only continue to grow more stringent and specific. Organizations that treat accessibility as an afterthought do so at significant legal and reputational risk. Whether you are part of a government agency, public university, a federal contractor, or private retailer, the message is clear: equal access to digital content is a civil right, and the legal infrastructure to enforce these rights are firmly in place.

Section 2: The Legal Landscape

Web accessibility lawsuits are a fairly recent development in the history of disability rights. One of the most significant trials was *Gil v. Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.*, which was decided in 2017. This decision led to the subsequent proliferation of accessibility lawsuits throughout the United States. In 2016, there were just 132 digital accessibility lawsuits in the U.S. But in 2017, the same year that *Gil v. Winn-Dixie* was decided, that number more than quadrupled with 814 lawsuits in 2017. After the *Gil v. Winn-Dixie* decision, the number of digital accessibility lawsuits spiked again, this time with an increase of 177%. 2018 saw 2,314 lawsuits. These numbers have continued to increase since 2017, with 2025 reaching a record-breaking number of over 5,100 digital accessibility lawsuits alone.⁹ This amounts to more than around 25,000 digital accessibility lawsuits filed in U.S. courts since 2018. Plus, these numbers don't include the even larger amount of private demand letters that have threatened litigation over the years. When these letters are factored into the legal landscape, the true volume of accessibility enforcement is dramatically higher. In addition to the pure numbers, there are a few important analytical points that emerge from the data.

I. Company Size Does Not Matter

Digital accessibility litigation makes little distinction by company size, industry, or prominence. Data demonstrates that a substantial share of lawsuits explicitly target smaller firms, particularly e-commerce businesses with less than \$25 million in revenue.¹⁰ Larger companies aren't immune, however. High-profile brands and

national companies have routinely been named in accessibility claims, reinforcing that plaintiffs and firms pursue litigation where it is easiest to identify and prove. Organizations of all sizes – from local businesses to global corporations – are equally susceptible to being sued when an accessibility gap is present.

II. Some Industries Are at a Higher Risk Than Others

Companies and organizations that are most aligned with the original intent behind the ADA are those with the highest risk. In other words, companies, organizations, and entities that provide access to goods and services or function as places of public accommodation are under greater scrutiny.⁹ So what industries are primarily investigated? Namely e-commerce, food and service providers, and healthcare. These industries made up the vast majority of digital accessibility lawsuits in 2025.⁹ E-commerce alone drove most cases, representing 70% of litigation. Further, 36% of the top e-commerce companies faced litigation in 2025. Including food and service providers as well as healthcare drives that percentage up to 93% of all state and federal digital accessibility litigation.¹¹

III. One Violation Doesn't Stop a Second One

Nearly half of federal cases targeted companies that had previously undergone litigation. According to UsableNet's 2025 Year-End Report, that number was 1,427 repeat offending lawsuits, or about 45% of all federal cases. Legal firms intentionally and actively monitor previous defendants for non-compliance, and the data shows that they will sue you again. So, if you do get sued or receive a demand letter, a simple settlement or fix of the listed complaints may not be enough to prevent another lawsuit. Only reaching full accessibility compliance will.

IV. AI Doesn't Cut It

There are two primary avenues that AI is used in the attempt to achieve digital accessibility: AI overlay widgets and AI lawsuits. You might be surprised to hear that pro se lawsuits, or those filed without an attorney, significantly increased. These lawsuits also tend to cite non-existent cases, fake data, and incorrect quotations, leading us to the conclusion that they are being filed with AI.¹² While it may be tempting to brush this off as something that wouldn't ever come to fruition, it's important to remember that even weak complaints require a response. This vast increase in these pro se filers will increase volume expeditiously.

In addition to pro se lawsuits, there are many companies who sell AI overlay widgets that promise accessibility compliance. These widgets do not change anything within your website or documents, instead installing an “overlay” to place additional elements into the website. Developers often claim that these overlays are compliant with WCAG, Section 508, and ADA standards. However, because these are overlays, they do not truly change anything on the website, which means that they cannot ensure accessibility compliance. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) agrees with this assessment. In 2025, the FTC issued a landmark decision fining accessibility widget creator accessiBe’s widget, accessWidget, for \$1 million.¹³ About this order, the FTC stated, “Despite the company’s claims, accessWidget did not make all user websites WCAG-compliant and these claims were false, misleading, or unsubstantiated.”¹⁴

In addition to the FTC, the U.S. Department of Justice also clarified their stance on AI usage to ensure accessibility standards: “Generative AI does not yet reliably automate the remediation of inaccessible content at scale.”¹⁵ The federal government has clearly established that AI cannot be used as a shortcut or a magic wand to fix accessibility compliance issues.

In sum, the litigation landscape makes one thing unmistakably clear: digital accessibility lawsuits are not a niche legal risk that only affect certain types of organizations. Rather, they are a pervasive and accelerating peril that reaches toward businesses of every size and across nearly every industry. With digital accessibility lawsuits increasing every year, repeat litigation targeting previous defendants, and AI-generated pro se complaints adding even more volume to the pipeline, the question is no longer whether your organization could be sued, but whether you’re prepared when it is. The data is unambiguous: organizations that fail to prioritize accessibility are not avoiding a problem but delaying a costly one.

Section 3: Key Cases

We’ve established that website accessibility lawsuits don’t discriminate by company size, industry, geography, or cultural prominence. The following cases span different industries, sizes, and years while demonstrating that every organization with a digital presence is a potential defendant.

I. National Federation of the Blind (NFB) v. Target Corporation (2006)

Industry: E-commerce/Retail

One of the first major e-commerce lawsuits targeting digital accessibility, Target ultimately settled for \$6 million. The plaintiffs alleged that Target's website featured missing alt text, image maps without textual options, missing form labels, no keyboard navigation functionality, screen reader incompatibility, and more. Judge Marilyn Hall Patel sided with the plaintiffs, affirming, "The ADA applies to the services of a place of public accommodation, not services in a place of public accommodation. To limit the ADA to discrimination in the provision of services occurring on the premises of a public accommodation would contradict the plain language of the statute."¹⁶ This was a major win for accessibility, and the Web Standards Commission says the case, "...fundamentally changed how retailers approached website accessibility. This case established that commercial websites must be accessible under the ADA."¹⁶

II. National Association of the Deaf (NAD) v. Netflix, Inc. (2011)

Industry: Entertainment

Before website accessibility lawsuits were commonplace, the National Association of the Deaf sued Netflix for violating the ADA. They claimed, "Approximately 36 million Americans are deaf or hard of hearing. Just as buildings without ramps prevent full access for people who use wheelchairs, television without captions excludes many deaf and hard of hearing individuals. For Plaintiff Lee Nettles and the members of the NAD and WMAD-HI, it was frustrating and isolating not to have full access to the popular Netflix service and other internet content."¹⁷ In short, Netflix was found guilty of failing to provide closed captioning for their streaming library. They settled for \$750,000 in attorney fees and agreed to caption its entire library within two years. This lawsuit was a foundational case in establishing that the ADA applies to digital content as well as physical.

III. NAD v. Harvard University (2015); NAD v. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2015)

Industry: Education

In 2015, the National Association of the Deaf on behalf of four of its members, alleged that Harvard University did not provide accurate

captioning on their video and audio content, like speeches, talks, lectures, courses, and other material that Harvard made available on their website, thus excluding deaf and hard of hearing people.¹⁸ The NAD filed a similar suit against the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.¹⁹ While Harvard argued that they were immune to ADA and Section 508 accessibility standards due to the content being developed by third parties, the court did not agree. This case is significant because it set an important precedent that educational institutions must also comply with accessibility standards, and that your organization is responsible for the accessibility of third-party tools.

IV. Robles v. Domino's Pizza, Inc. (2016)

Industry: Food Services

In 2016, Guillermo Robles filed a lawsuit claiming damages against Domino's Pizza, as neither its website nor mobile app were compatible with assistive technology (i.e., Robles' screen reader). Domino's, however, argued that the ADA did not apply to their services as, "The Department of Justice (DOJ) had not published any actionable guidance to adhere to accessibility standards."²⁰ While the first judge who saw this case dismissed it, Robles persisted. Eventually, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the ADA did, in fact, apply to Domino's online platforms.

V. Bone v. University of North Carolina (UNC) Health Care System and Nash Hospitals, Inc. (2018)

Industry: Healthcare

Through the National Federation of the Blind (NFB), plaintiff John Bone alleged that the defendants, "provide critical communications, such as health care notices, visit summaries, follow-up instructions, forms, questionnaires, invoices, and other types of documents, only in standard print, a format inaccessible to blind individuals."²¹ Further, they alleged, "When blind patients have requested accessible alternative forms such as Braille or large print, UNC, Nash, and their providers have routinely failed to provide them."²¹ Ultimately, Nash Hospitals agreed to pay \$150,000 in damages to Bone and forgive his medical debts. Additionally, UNC settled for \$125,000 in damages and agreed to implement update accessibility policies.

VI. *Burbon v. Fox News Network, LLC* (2018)

Industry: Media, News, and Entertainment

This class-action lawsuit focused on Fox News' noncompliance with WCAG 2.0 standards. The lack of accessibility involved screen reader incompatibility, a lack of alt text, broken and redundant links, and more.²² In other words, it blocked *Burbon* and fellow plaintiffs from being able to view live broadcasts and receive goods and services that are available at physical locations – all of which, *Burbon et al* claimed, was a form of discrimination against disabled people. The court agreed, and Fox settled the lawsuit, agreeing to make their website compliant.

VII. *Conner v. Parkwood Entertainment, LLC* (2019)

Industry: Entertainment/Music

Beyonce, one of the world's most recognizable pop stars, is known for her music and fashion. She also owns and founded Parkwood Entertainment, a multifaceted management, production, and entertainment company and record label. Drawing significant media attention, Parkwood Entertainment was sued for numerous ADA and Section 508 accessibility violations, such as missing alt text, inaccessible drop-down menus, missing navigation links, no prompting and labeling, no keyboard access, empty and redundant links, and more.²³

VIII. *Rodriguez v. Barnes & Noble, Inc.* (2022)

Industry: E-commerce/Retail

Plaintiff Daniel Rodriguez filed a class-action lawsuit against Barnes & Noble in 2022 alleging that their website was not fully compatible with screen reading software, which denied him equal access to their goods and services. As a major retailer with significant online sales, Barnes & Noble became one big retailer among many who would face accessibility litigation in the coming years. This case is a reminder that large, recognizable brand names are not immune to accessibility standards.

IX. *Farmer v. Sweetgreen, Inc.* (2016); *Colak v. Sweetgreen, Inc.* (2024)

Industry: Food Services

Fast-casual restaurant Sweetgreen was first sued for website accessibility violations in 2016 and settled, agreeing to work toward full compliance.

However, eight years later, they were sued yet again for containing, “barriers to screen-reading software used by individuals who are blind or visually impaired to access the internet.”²⁴ This case is a powerful illustration in the world of digital accessibility law that compliance is not a one-time achievement. Instead, it requires continual monitoring, testing, and remediation. And further, if you’ve been sued once, you’re likely to be sued again if compliance standards slip.

X. NFB v. Walmart, Inc. (2018); Thompson v. Walmart, Inc. (2021); Frost v. Walmart, Inc. (2024)

Industry: E-commerce/Retail

Walmart, the nation’s largest retailer,²⁵ has faced and is facing multiple website accessibility lawsuits. Despite having large legal and IT teams, not to mention the resources to fully comply with ADA, Section 508, and WCAG requirements, their website remains non-compliant. In 2018, the NFB sued Walmart for their self-checkout kiosks being inaccessible to blind users: “The suit claimed that an employee attempted to take money from one of the plaintiffs during the checkout process. The employee allegedly took cash back from the customer’s account as they assisted in checking out.”²⁶ Walmart faced a similar complaint in 2021, alleging that their website and self-checkout kiosks were not compliant with the ADA.²⁷ A more recent suit in 2024 alleged similar issues, though this time, focusing on pop-up window content, missing alt text, and incomplete link descriptions.²⁸ These cases demonstrate that neither a company’s brand name recognition nor having been sued previously will prevent you from being targeted again.

The legal landscape surrounding digital ADA compliance continues to evolve, but one theme remains consistent: accessibility is not optional. Courts continually agree that digital experiences must be inclusive, and plaintiffs are successfully suing inaccessible organizations across industries, size, and location. Among the most frequently cited issues in these cases is the absence or misuse of alt text, which directly impacts the ability of individuals using assistive technology to access essential content. Organizations that prioritize accessibility not only reduce legal risk but also demonstrate a broader commitment to equal access online.

The cases outlined in this section span nearly two decades, multiple industries, and range from entertainment to food services and healthcare. No organization is too large, too small, too prominent, too unknown, or too resource-rich to be held accountable for digital accessibility failures. The recurring violations across these cases, like missing alt text and screen reader incompatibility, are not obscure technical fringe issues. Rather, they are foundational requirements for accessibility that courts have routinely held up as legal obligations. Perhaps most telling is the pattern of repeat litigation: Sweetgreen was sued twice, Walmart three times. This reinforces what the data has already told us: a settlement or one-time fix is not enough. Sustained, proactive compliance is the only true protection.

Section 4: The Alt Text Problem

Alt text, or alternative text, is the written description that's embedded into an image. It allows screen readers and other assistive technology to convey visual content to people who are blind or have low vision. Alt text can also help provide context when an image cannot load or be indexed, providing access outside of the disability community. It's also the primary way that search engines and AI systems understand image content. Despite its importance, many websites face the persistent problem of missing alt text. While creating accurate and meaningful descriptions can be difficult, it becomes even more of a burden at scale. When a website has millions of images, it's easy to deprioritize and ignore the question of alt text. As a result, vast portions of digital content remain inaccessible.

Missing alt text also represents a measurable business risk and missing opportunity. Data demonstrates that accessible content can improve search performance, expand audience reach, and enhance user engagement. And that doesn't even begin to cover the reputational benefits of accessibility and alt text. The scale of the alt text problem across the web is not a matter of speculation. It's well-documented, and the numbers are striking.

Statistics

The following statistics illustrate both the prevalence of alt text failings across the web, as well as the tangible impact that it has on a website's usability. Together, they make

the case that alt text is not a minor technical checkbox but a meaningful level for compliance and growth.

- 53.1% of the top million homepages are missing alt text.¹
- 16.2% of all home page images did not have any alt text.¹
- 10.8% of images with alt text had repetitive, inaccurate, or incorrect alt text, like "alt=image."¹
- 25% of linked images were missing alt text.¹
- 93% of domains feature at least one inaccessible image on their website.²⁹

Alt text is one of the most overlooked elements of web accessibility. But the good news is that it is also one of the most fixable. Unlike broad overhauls or redesigns, implementing alt text can yield measurable returns, like reduced legal exposure, improved SEO, and a more seamless experience for every user. For organizations serious about accessibility, alt text is not the finish line but rather, the starting place.

Section 5: Splash Box® Marketing's Solution

Of all WCAG failures, missing alt text is the most common, the most consequential, the most preventable, and yet, the most difficult to scale. That's why Splash Box® Marketing built Splash Access™ Alt Text. This patent-pending alt text generator creates clear, context-aware, and WCAG-compliant alt text in under 60 seconds. With a single upload, Splash Access™ analyzes the image, interprets its context, and generates informative and natural alt text that's aligned with WCAG 2.1AA standards. A task that once demanded meticulous and manual attention, repeated across every image on every page of every project, is now nearly effortless. And when you have thousands of images across hundreds of documents – or more – Splash Access™ Alt Text will save you time, money, and improve your workflows.

Key Features

Beyond simply automating alt text, Splash Access™ Alt Text also improves equity and access, simplifies your workflow, lowers legal risks, features flexible pricing and dedicated support, and conquers high-volume documents with ease, all while offering a seamless experience and great customer service. Some of the detailed features include:

- Generates ADA, Section 508, and WCAG compliant alt text instantly for both individual and/or bulk images.
- Eliminates manual writing.

- Reduces human error and production bottlenecks.
- Lets you easily review and edit before publishing.
- Improves readability of information for everyone.
- Seamlessly integrates with your workflows by adding alt text directly into your document.
- Speeds up publishing timelines.
- Keeps your organization aligned with accessibility standards.
- Scales across large document sets while maintaining consistent quality at one – or one thousand – images.
- Transparent and predictable pricing with credit-based structure.

Who It's For

Splash Access™ Alt Text was designed for any organization that publishes images, but it's especially valuable for:

- Businesses managing large product image catalogs.
- Government agencies and public universities facing compliance deadlines.
- Healthcare organizations.
- Educational institutions.
- Media companies and publishers with image-heavy content archives.
- Marketing agencies and accessibility consultants serving clients across industries.
- Small- or mid-size businesses that can't afford an accessibility lawsuit.
- Anyone who prioritizes accessibility standards.

Why Splash Access™ Is Different

Accessibility overlay widgets – tools marketed as plug-and-play compliance solutions – have not protected organizations from lawsuits, as we have demonstrated. Splash Access™ Alt Text takes a fundamentally different approach. It generates actual, embedded alt text that is inserted directly into a remediated PDF. There are many alt text generators available online, but none – other than Splash Access™ Alt Text – that insert the text directly into your documents.

Section 6: Conclusion

From foundational legal cases to the DOJ's recent ADA updates, the legal record is clear. The direction of digital accessibility law has only focused on expanding coverage, raising standards, and increasing enforcement. We've seen this throughout

the last decade: over 30,000 website accessibility lawsuits,³⁰ landmark settlements against Netflix, Domino's, Beyoncé, and more, cases explicitly naming missing alt text and other accessibility issues as discrimination. The question for any organization with a digital presence is not whether accessibility matters. We know it does. The question is what will your next step be? Will your action come before or after a lawsuit?

Take Action Today

Splash Box® Marketing offers the following next steps for organizations and businesses ready to take the next step in addressing digital accessibility:

- Visit **accessalttext.com** to explore Splash Access™ Alt Text and request a free demo.
- Schedule a free call with one of our accessibility experts at calendly.com/splashbox.

Citations and Further Reading

1 WebAIM, *The WebAim Million: The 2026 report on the accessibility of the top 1,000,000 home pages*, 2026, <https://webaim.org/projects/million/>.

2 United States Department of Justice, Archives, *Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta Delivers Remarks on the Web Accessibility Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 2023, <https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/speech/associate-attorney-general-vanita-gupta-delivers-remarks-web-accessibility-notice>.

3 United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, *The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) protects people with disabilities from discrimination*, www.ada.gov.

4 United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, *Guidance on Web Accessibility and the ADA*, 2022, <https://www.ada.gov/resources/web-guidance/>.

5 National Archives, *Federal Register, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability; Accessibility of Web Information and Services of State and Local Government Entities*, 2024, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/24/2024-07758/nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-disability-accessibility-of-web-information-and-services-of-state>.

6 United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, *Fact Sheet: New Rule on the Accessibility of Web Content and Mobile Apps Provided by State and Local Governments*, 2024, <https://www.ada.gov/resources/2024-03-08-web-rule/>.

7 Section 508, *It Accessibility Laws and Policies*, 2025, <https://www.section508.gov/manage/laws-and-policies/>.

8 Web Accessibility Initiative, WCAG 2 Overview, 2026, <https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag/>.

9 UsableNet, 2025 Year-End Digital Accessibility Lawsuit Report, 2025, https://info.usablenet.com/2025-year-end-report-on-web-accessibility-lawsuits?_gl=1*16yttth*_gcl_au*NzA5MTUzNDQ0LjE3Nzc0OTMzODU.*_ga*NjgxNTg5MDU3LjE3Nzc0OTMzODY.*_ga_GHSPW6BGTY*cZ3Nzk0Njc3ODQkbzMkZzEkdDE3Nzk0Njc4MzlkaEYJGwwJGgw.

10 CLYM, *Accessibility Lawsuits Up 37% in 2025: What SMBs Must Do*, 2025, <https://www.clym.io/blog/accessibility-lawsuits-2025-small-business-websites>.

11 Splash Box® Marketing, *ADA Website Lawsuits Surge Again in 2025*, 2026, <https://www.splashbox.com/post/ada-website-lawsuits-surge-again-in-2025>.

12 Splash Box® Marketing, *2025 Digital Accessibility Lawsuits: What Changed and What to Do Now*, 2026, <https://www.splashbox.com/post/2025-digital-accessibility-lawsuits-what-changed-and-what-to-do-now>.

13 Splash Box® Marketing, *FTC Cracks Down on Misleading AI Accessibility Claims*, 2026, <https://www.splashbox.com/post/ftc-cracks-down-on-misleading-ai-accessibility-claims>.

14 Federal Trade Commission, *FTC Approves Final Order Requiring accessiBe to pay \$1 Million*, 2025, <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2025/04/ftc-approves-final-order-requiring-accessibe-pay-1-million>.

15 Federal Register, *Extension of Compliance Dates for Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability; Accessibility of Web Information and Services of State and Local Government Entities*, 2026, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/04/20/2026-07663/extension-of-compliance-dates-for-nondiscrimination-on-the-basis-of-disability-accessibility-of-web#p-99>.

16 Web Standards Commission, *NFB v. Target Corporation*, <https://wsc.us.org/case-target>.

17 Feinberg, Jackson, Worthman, & Wasow, *National Association of the Deaf et al. v. Netflix, Inc.*, https://feinbergjackson.com/post_cases/national-association-of-the-deaf-et-al-v-netflix-inc/.

18 Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse, *Case: National Association of the Deaf v. Harvard University*, 2023, <https://clearinghouse.net/case/14352/>.

19 Disability Law United, *National Association of the Deaf v. Harvard and National Association of the Deaf v. MIT*, <https://disabilitylawunited.org/case/online-content-lawsuit-harvard-mit/>.

20 Accessibility.com, *What was Robles v. Domino's Pizza?*, 2024, <https://www.accessibility.com/blog/what-was-robles-v-dominos-pizza>.

21 National Federation of the Blind, *Civil Court Case v. University of North Carolina Health Care System and Nash Health Care Systems*, <https://nfb.org/sites/nfb.org/files/files-pdf/UNC-Nash-Complaint-ACE.pdf>.

22 ClassAction.org, *Class Action Complaint v. Fox News Network, LLC.*, <https://www.classaction.org/media/burbon-v-fox-news-network-llc.pdf>.

23 Accessibility.com, *Conner v. Parkwood Entertainment, LLC*, <https://www.accessibility.com/digital-lawsuits/mary-parkwood-2019-01-4>.

24 NRN, *New lawsuit against Sweetgreen claims its website violates the Americans with Disabilities Act*, 2024, <https://www.nrn.com/fast-casual/new-lawsuit-against-sweetgreen-claims-its-website-violates-the-americans-with-disabilities-act>.

25 National Retail Federation, *Top 100 Retailers 2025 List*, <https://nrf.com/research-insights/top-retailers/top-100-retailers/top-100-retailers-2025-list>.

26 Vispero, *The Legal Case: Why Your Kiosk Should be Accessible*, 2021, <https://vispero.com/resources/the-legal-case-why-your-kiosk-should-be-accessible/>.

27 Lookit Design, *More Major Corporations Sued Over Website Accessibility*, 2026, <https://lookitdesign.com/more-major-corporations-sued-over-website-accessibility/>.

28 ClassAction.org, *Shoppers With Visual Disabilities Denied Equal Access to Walmart.com, Class Action Claims*, 2024, <https://www.classaction.org/news/shoppers-with-visual-disabilities-denied-equal-access-to-walmart.com-class-action-claims>.

29 <https://www.audioeye.com/post/accessibility-statistics/#image-accessibility-statistics>

30 According to UsableNet's data from year-end reports, 2018-2025, https://info.usablenet.com/2025-year-end-report-on-web-accessibility-lawsuits?_gl=1*16yttth*_gcl_au*NzA5MTUzNDQ0LjE3Nzc0OTMzODU.*_ga*NjgxNTg5MDU3LjE3Nzc0OTMzODY.*_ga_GHSPW6BGTY*cZ_E3Nzk0Njc3ODQkbzMkZzEkdE3Nzk0Njc4MzlkajEyJGwwJGgw.