COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CLAIMS BOARD

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

John Naimo
Auditor-Controller

Steven E. NyBlom
Chief Executive Office

Patrick A. Wu
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold its regular meeting on **Monday, July 2, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.**, in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.

2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session - Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).

   a. Claim of Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London

      This claim seeks compensation for damages to real and personal property caused by a broken water main owned and operated by the County Waterworks District; settlement is recommended in the amount of $100,000.

      See Supporting Documents.

   b. Angela Huerta v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
      Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. VC 056 784

      This lawsuit arises from injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee of the Sheriff's Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of $33,000.

      See Supporting Documents.

c. Jaime Zurita v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 11-01552

This lawsuit concerns allegations of false arrest and excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of $400,000.

See Supporting Documents.

d. Kerry Kae Robinson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 415 891

This lawsuit concerns allegations of false arrest and excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of $600,000.

See Supporting Documents.

e. D.M.C., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 433 664

This lawsuit seeks compensation for minors for the alleged wrongful death of their father caused by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of $900,000.

See Supporting Documents.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

5. Approval of the minutes of the June 18, 2012, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

See Supporting Document.

6. Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

7. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Non-Litigated Claim of Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London
CASE NUMBER		N/A
COURT		N/A
DATE FILED		March 23, 2009
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Public Works – Waterworks District
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Andreas Phelps, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Brian T. Chu Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		On February 18, 2009, a water main line adjacent to 26060 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, which is a residential building insured by Claimant, broke and resulted in a major leakage of water and mud that intruded into the building. The mud and water resulted in damage to the building, interior furnishings, and personal property. The Claimant paid its insured the value of the damages incurred in the incident and seeks reimbursement of those damages. The water main line is owned and operated by the Los Angeles County Waterworks District

Number 29. A County Waterworks Division crew found that the leak was caused by corrosion of the 8-inch pipe. The leak itself was not created by any impact to the line.

Due to the inherent risks and uncertainties involved in a trial, and the potential liability and potential exposure to an adverse verdict, the County proceeded with settlement negotiations and was eventually able to develop this recommended settlement.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	0

Summary Corrective Action Plan

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Claim/Lawsuit: Date of incident/event:	Certain Underwriters At Lloyd's Of London ASO Farshad Harandi February 18, 2009
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On February 18, 2009, a leak occurred within an 8-inch-diameter water mainline, owned by Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 29, adjacent to 26060 Pacific Coast Highway in the City of Malibu. As a result, water discharged from the leak and flooded Farshad Harandi's property. causing significant personal property damage and interior damage to his residence.

1 Briefly describe the root cause of the claim/lawsuit:

The claimant alleges the Waterworks District failed to mitigate the damage to their insured's property by not shutting off the water in a timely manner and is therefore claiming inverse condemnation.

A Waterworks Division (WWD) crew responded to the incident location within 45 minutes of the incident and repaired the leak by installing 8 feet of polyvinyl chloride pipe. According to WWD, the water mainline was old and corroded, which allowed the leak to develop.

2 Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

To minimize the occurrence of similar future incidents in the Waterworks District, WWD has identified pipelines vulnerable to leaks for periodical and/or as-needed evaluation that includes a leak detection investigation by the Waterworks District's specialized leak detection contractor These pipelines were selected based on site geology, age, number of previous leaks, number of customers they serve, and the potential impact on private properties in case of a leak. WWD will continue to add pipelines to our list of pipelines vulnerable to leaks as the need arises.

If a leak is detected by our contractor, WWD analyzes the possible cause(s) using site-specific information and staff knowledge of the system and determines the most appropriate course of action(s), which could include repair and or replacement of the pipeline including, in some cases, bringing the pipeline above ground when necessary

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance)

- ☐ Potentially has a Countywide implication.
- ☐ Potentially has implications to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments)
- ☒ Does not appear to have Countywide or other department implications.

Signature: (Risk Management Coordinator) Steven G. Steinhoff	Date: 5-05-2011
Signature: (Director) Gail Farber	Date: 5-12-11.

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch

Name: LEO COSTANTINO	Date:
Signature:	Date: 5/20/2011

RS:psr
P4:\SCAP CERTAIN UNDER3

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Angela Huerta v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		VC056784
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		July 20, 2010
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	33,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Steven B. Wolter, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Gregory Houle, Esq. Brian T. Chu, Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a motor vehicle negligence lawsuit which occurred on August 21, 2009. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $33,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	25,731
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	3,424

Case Name: **Angela Huerta v. County of Los Angeles**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Friday, August 21, 2009, at approximately 11:00 a.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Angela Huerta v. County of Los Angeles** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2011-020 On Friday, August 21, 2009, at approximately 11:00 a.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff was driving a standard black and white Los Angeles County-owned patrol vehicle south on Pioneer Boulevard, north of Waddell Street, Whittier (unincorporated Los Angeles County). While negotiating a U-turn to northbound Pioneer Boulevard, the vehicle the deputy sheriff was driving collided with the plaintiff's vehicle.

1. Briefly describe the **root cause(s)** of the claim/lawsuit:

The plaintiff claims damages for injuries she sustained in the traffic collision.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

This section intentionally left blank.

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance).

- ☐ Potentially has Countywide implications.
- ☐ Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).
- ☑ Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 7/18/11

Name: (Department Head) Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division	
Signature:	Date: 07/20/11

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch

Name: LEO COSTANTINO	
Signature:	Date: 7/27/2011

I:Risk Mgt. Inspector General/CAP-SCAP-RECAP/Summary Corrective Action Plan Form 2-01-10 (Final).docx

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Jaime Zurita v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		Case No. CV1101552
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		Complaint filed February 22, 2011 Claim filed August 26, 2009
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	400,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Michael Mills Law Offices of Michael Mills
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Jennifer A.D. Lehman
NATURE OF CASE		Plaintiff Jaime Zurita claims he was detained without probable cause and subjected to excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies. Mr. Zurita alleges federal civil rights violations and State law causes of action for false arrest, assault and battery. The Deputies contend that there was probable cause to arrest Mr. Zurita and that the force used to overcome Mr. Zurita's resistance was reasonable. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, and in light of the fact that a prevailing plaintiff in a

		federal civil rights lawsuit is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $400,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	29,124.50
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	15,426.80

Case Name: **Jaime Gonzalez Zurita v. County of Los Angeles**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Saturday February 28, 2009; approximately 11:58 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Jaime Gonzalez Zurita v. County of Los Angeles** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2012-013 On Saturday, February 28, 2009, at approximately 11:58 p.m., two Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs returned to 2249 122nd Street, Los Angeles, to a report of cockfighting and illegal drug use. The deputies detained six to eight people. During their investigation, the deputies became involved in a violent altercation with one of the individuals being detained (plaintiff). With the assistance of two additional deputy sheriffs, the plaintiff was finally subdued and handcuffed.

1. Briefly describe the **root cause(s)** of the claim/lawsuit:

The plaintiff was transported to St. Francis Medical Center for injuries to his head, face, and neck area.

In his lawsuit, the plaintiff alleged he was subjected to unreasonable force committed by members of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of the incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum sufficiently addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

The facts in this case were reviewed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee. The committee concluded that the level of physical force used by the deputy sheriffs was reasonable, necessary, and in compliance with Department policy.

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance).

- ☐ Potentially has Countywide implications.
- ☐ Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).
- ☒ Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 6/8/12

Name: (Department Head) Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division	
Signature:	Date: 6/11/12

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch

Name: LEO COSTANTINO	
Signature:	Date: 6-18-2012

i:Risk Mgt. Inspector General/CAP-SCAP-RECAP/Summary Corrective Action Plan Form 2-01-10 (Final).docx

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Kerry Kae Robinson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		Case No. BC415891
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		Complaint filed June 18, 2009 Claim filed May 15, 2009
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	600,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Brett Greenfield, Esq. David Kenner, Esq. Kenner Law Firm, P.C.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Jennifer A.D. Lehman
NATURE OF CASE		Plaintiff Kerry Kae Robinson alleges that her civil rights were violated when she was detained and arrested by two Sheriff's Deputies without reasonable suspicion or probable cause and subjected to excessive force. The Deputies contend that the detention and arrest were based on reasonable suspicion and probable cause, and that the force was reasonable. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, and in light of the fact that a prevailing plaintiff in a

		federal civil rights lawsuit is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $600,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	62,986.00
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	61,326.47

Case Name: **Kerry Kae Robinson v. County of Los Angeles**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Wednesday, March 11, 2009; approximately 11:35 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Kerry Kae Robinson v. County of Los Angeles** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2012-007 On Wednesday, March 11, 2009, at approximately 11:39 p.m., a Los Angeles County deputy sheriff was patrolling an area plagued by recent acts of vandalism when he saw a stationary vehicle with two occupants. He stopped to contact the occupants. During the deputy's investigation, he became involved in a violent confrontation with the passenger in the vehicle (plaintiff). During her assault, the plaintiff struck the deputy several times in the face. With the assistance of two other deputy sheriffs, the plaintiff was finally subdued and handcuffed.

1. Briefly describe the **root cause(s)** of the claim/lawsuit:

The plaintiff was transported to Huntington Hospital where it was determined she sustained an orbital fracture.

In her lawsuit, the plaintiff alleged she was subjected to false arrest and the use of unreasonable force committed by two Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of the incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum sufficiently addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

The facts in this case were reviewed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee. The committee concluded that the level of physical force used by the deputy sheriffs was reasonable, necessary, and in compliance with Department policy.

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments: (If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance).

- ☐ Potentially has Countywide implications.
- ☐ Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).
- ☑ Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 6/7/12

Name: (Department Head) Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division	
Signature:	Date: 6/11/12

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch

Name: LEO COSTANTINO	
Signature:	Date: 6-19-2012

I:Risk Mgt. Inspector General/CAP-SCAP-RECAP/Summary Corrective Action Plan Form 2-01-10 (Final).docx

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		D.M.C., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		LASC Case No. BC433664
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		Complaint filed: March 12, 2010 Claim: September 30, 2009
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	900,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Brian T. Dunn, Esq. The Cochran Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Jennifer A.D. Lehman
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $900,000, the lawsuit filed by minors D.M.C. and D.J.C., through their Guardians ad Litem, for the alleged wrongful death of their father, Derrick Collins. Plaintiffs allege that a Deputy Sheriff, without probable cause, confronted decedent and inflicted several gunshot wounds which proved fatal. The Deputy contends that probable cause existed for the force used in response to Plaintiff's actions.

However, due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $900,000 is recommended.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	323,132
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	162,625

Case Name: **D.M.C., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**

Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	Monday, September 14, 2009; approximately 10:07 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**D.M.C., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.** Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2012-006 On Monday, September 14, 2009, at approximately 10:07 p.m., two Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs were on patrol in a standard, County-owned black and white patrol vehicle searching for two suspects involved in an earlier armed robbery. While searching for the suspects, the deputies saw two men who matched the suspects' description standing in the driveway of 1234 Poindexter Street. Believing the men may have committed the robbery, the deputies stopped to investigate. Upon seeing the deputies exit their patrol vehicle, one of the men (decedent) reached for his waistband and began running down the driveway away from the deputies. While one deputy pursued the man on foot, the second deputy detained the second man at the scene. The deputy pursued the man down the driveway to the corner of the garage. The deputy saw the man open a wooden gate with his left hand while simultaneously reaching for his waistband with his right hand. As the man stepped behind the wooden gate, he stopped and turned toward the deputy. As he turned, the deputy saw the man holding a black object in his right hand, an object the deputy believed to be a handgun. Fearing for his safety, the deputy fired three rounds from his duty weapon. All three rounds struck the man. The deputy requested medical aid for the man. Paramedics pronounced the man dead at the scene.

1. Briefly describe the **root cause(s)** of the claim/lawsuit:

The decedent's minor children filed a lawsuit for the alleged wrongful death of their father.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:
(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department had relevant policies and procedures/protocols in effect at the time of this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's training curriculum addresses the circumstances which occurred in this incident.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's administrative review revealed employee misconduct. As a result, appropriate administrative action was taken.

3. State if the corrective actions are applicable to only your department or other County departments:
(If unsure, please contact the Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch for assistance).

- ☐ Potentially has Countywide implications.
- ☐ Potentially has an implication to other departments (i.e., all human services, all safety departments, or one or more other departments).
- ☑ Does not appear to have Countywide or other department(s) implications.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)	
Shaun J. Mathers, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 6/4/12

Name: (Department Head)	
Roberta A. Abner, Chief Leadership and Training Division	
Signature:	Date: 06/07/12

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Branch

Name: LEO COSTANTINO	
Signature:	Date: 6-18-2012

i:Risk Mgt. Inspector General/CAP-SCAP-RECAP/Summary Corrective Action Plan Form 2-01-10 (Final).docx

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

June 18, 2012

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 1:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

Claims Board Members present at the meeting were: John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Jennifer Lehman, Christopher Keosian, Rosemarie Belda, and Joyce Aiello; Sheriff's Department: Lt. Patrick Hunter; Department of Health Services: Karen M. Lampert, Joi L. Williams, and Edgar Soto; Department of Human Resources: Comelita Farris; Outside Counsel: Scott Boyer, Calvin House and Maureen Thomas.

2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).

At 1:00 p.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(e) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 2:38 p.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. <u>Larry Berry v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u>
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 446 954

This lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies on an incarcerated inmate.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $82,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser and Patrick Wu

b. **Myone Bollinger v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 414 944

This lawsuit concerns allegations that a Sheriff's Department employee was subjected to disability discrimination and that the Department failed to engage in the interactive process.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $1,250,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu

c. **Oliver Mbolo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 458 861

This lawsuit concerns allegations that a Department of Health Services employee was subjected to discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and adverse employment actions.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $145,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu

d. **Maygi Li v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 463 394

This lawsuit concerns allegations that a Department of Health Services employee was subjected to sexual harassment, disability discrimination, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $98,500.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu

e. **Justine Yee v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 463 188

This lawsuit concerns allegations that a Department of Health Services employee was subjected to sexual harassment, disability discrimination, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of this matter in the amount of $98,500.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu

5. **Approval of the minutes of the June 4, 2012, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 - John Naimo, Laurie Milhiser, and Patrick Wu

6. **Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.**

No such matters were discussed.

7. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By Carol J. Slosson
Carol J. Slosson