



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CLAIMS BOARD
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Arlene Barrera
Auditor-Controller
Steve Robles
Chief Executive Office
Roger H. Granbo
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, August 7, 2017, 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. Angiolina Storti v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 552 462

This lawsuit arises from damages and injuries sustained when Plaintiff was run over by a sport utility vehicle driven by a County employee from the Department of Beaches and Harbors; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$2,400,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- b. Melissa Veluz-Abraham, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 511 286

This dangerous condition lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from the death of a bicyclist in the unincorporated area of Monte Nido in the Santa Monica Mountains; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$800,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- c. Cindy Esquivias v. Prosport Express, Inc. et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 025 664

This dangerous condition lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from injuries sustained in an automobile accident at an intersection in the City of Palmdale; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$25,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- d. Joe Rivera v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 593 845

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- e. Claim of Donnell Thompson, Sr.

This wrongful death claim arises out of the fatal Deputy-involved shooting of Plaintiff's son; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,490,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- f. Lisa Lopez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 16-00098

This lawsuit concerns allegations of civil rights violations, battery, negligence, and wrongful death by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- g. Claim of Alicia Juarez

This claim alleges that Plaintiff, who is blind, has been denied access to the Sheriff's Department website in violation of federal disability civil rights laws; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$30,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- h. Julia Graves, et al. v. Sheriff's Department, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 14-08403

This lawsuit alleges that a minor in the custody of the Probation Department was assaulted by a Probation Officer; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- i. Xavier H. by and through his Guardian Ad Litem, Charlene Peacock v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 524 503

This lawsuit concerns allegations of civil rights violations and breach of mandatory duties by the Department of Children and Family Services when Plaintiff was in a foster home where he was assaulted by another foster youth; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$95,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- j. Kim Pavek v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 587 609

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Medical Examiner-Coroner was subjected to retaliation and sexual harassment and that the Department failed to prevent harassment; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$400,000.

- 4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.
- 5. Approval of the minutes of the July 17, 2017, 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	Angiolina Storti v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC552462
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	July 22, 2014
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Beaches and Harbors
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 2,400,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Steven V. Angarella Angarella Law
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Richard K. Kudo Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a May 14, 2014, accident when a vehicle driven by a County Department of Beaches and Harbor employee rolled over plaintiff Angiolina Storti, who was lying on the sand at the south end of Venice Beach in the Via Marina Peninsula area near the north channel. Ms. Storti claims to have suffered injuries and damages as a result of the accident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 79,685
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 35,989



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:	May 14, 2014
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	An employee drove over a member of the public.

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

The patron was obscured from the line of sight, the employee failed to observe the patron's presence and failed to thoroughly examine the path of travel prior to making a right turn from a stopped position.

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


As a result of this accident, the following actions were taken:

- May 2014 – September 2014, actions of employee reviewed by safety staff and Performance Management unit for potential administrative action. Responsible party: Director
- June 2014 – July 2014, meetings held with driving staff to emphasize the dangers and potential consequences of right-turn blind spots. Responsible party: Division Chief
- July 2014, the Department began a comprehensive review of the "Circle of Safety" scope of application, the internal vehicle policy, the external vehicle policy of another County department and driver training for staff. Responsible party(s): Chief Deputy Director, Division Chief and Human Resources Manager
- On October 24, 2014, employee received an unpaid suspension. Responsible party: Director
- On June 2, 2015, final revisions made to vehicle policy which included new sections for driving in areas of public activity and making right-turns. Responsible party: Chief Deputy Director
- On July 1, 2015, the revised vehicle policy was implemented department-wide. Responsible party: Chief Deputy Director
- On June 30, 2015, Right Turn Policy/Procedure and additional training finalized. Responsible party(s): Human Resources Manager and Division Chief
- November 2016, Right Turn Procedure and training were revised a second time. Responsible party(s): Division Chief and Safety Officer
- May 2017, the Department is in the initial stages of further revising internal vehicle policy(s) and upon completion will secure the necessary approvals prior to formal adoption. Responsible party: Chief Deputy Director

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan


3. Are the corrective actions addressing department-wide system issues?

- ☒ Yes – The corrective actions address department-wide system issues.
☐ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) MICHELLE CHARLES, MANAGEMENT FELLOW	
Signature: 	Date: May 15, 2017

Name: (Department Head) GARY JONES, DIRECTOR	
Signature: 	Date: 5-16-17

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?
☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. ☐ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) DESTINY CASTRO	
Signature: 	Date: 5/15/2017

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Melissa Veluz-Abraham, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC511286
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	June 5, 2013
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 800,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Bruce A. Broillet Greene Broillet & Wheeler, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Richard K. Kudo Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises out of a fatality caused by a solo bicycle accident when Willis Veluz-Abraham lost control of his bicycle while riding down Stunt Road in the unincorporated area of Monte Nido and died after crossing over the center line rumble strip, crossing the lane for traffic in the opposite direction, and riding off the road onto a dirt shoulder and off an embankment. Plaintiffs are Mr. Veluz-Abraham's widow Melissa Veluz-Abraham, their two minor children Ajani Veluz-Abraham and Asante Veluz-Abraham, and the Estate of Willis Veluz-Abraham, all of whom claim to have suffered damages as a result of Mr. Veluz-Abraham's death. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 348,011
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 151,844

Case Name: VELUZ-ABRAHAM, MELISSA, 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:	July 14, 2012
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On July 14, 2012, Willis Veluz-Abraham (Decedent) was riding his bicycle on Stunt Road, 3.12 miles south of Mulholland Highway in the unincorporated area of Monte Nido. He rounded a curve and crossed the centerline and rumble strip and continued through the shoulder down a slope, hitting a metal debris rack. He suffered fatal injuries. It is alleged that the centerline with a rumble strip presented a dangerous condition of public property.

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

According to the Traffic Collision Report (TCR), the Decedent was found at fault for the incident due to crossing the existing solid double yellow centerline with a rumble strip, in violation of Section 22107 of the CVC.

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

In accordance with Traffic and Lighting Division's (T&L's) August 24, 2014, Fatal/Severe Injury study, T&L conducted a traffic study to determine if additional traffic control devices were warranted for the subject location. As part of the traffic study, T&L reviewed the completed TCR, various department records, and evaluated the existing traffic control devices at the subject location.

As a result of this study, T&L determined that no additional traffic control devices were warranted at the subject location to address the incident.

A follow-up review of the location was conducted on December 21, 2016, by T&L. Based on this review, two large one-directional arrow signs and supplemental object markers will be installed at the subject curve.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing departmentwide system issues?

- ☐ Yes – The corrective actions address departmentwide system issues.
- ☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)

Signature: MICHAEL HAYS

Date:

3/30/17

Name: (Department Head)

Signature: [Signature]

Date:

5/1/17

DAP
4/27/17

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY

Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?

☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have Countywide applicability.

☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General)

Signature: Destiny Castro

Date:

3/30/2017

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Cindy Esquivias v. Prosport Express, Inc., et al.
CASE NUMBER	MC025664
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	August 6, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 25,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	R. Rex Parris R. Rex Parris Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Richard K. Kudo Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises out of a two vehicle collision that occurred on August 8, 2014, at the intersection of Avenue N and 70 th Street East in the unincorporated area of the County near Palmdale, when the vehicle driven by plaintiff Cindy Esquivias collided with the tractor trailer driven by defendant Eugheni Donici. Plaintiff alleges that the Avenue N/70 th Street East intersection represented a dangerous condition of public property. Ms. Esquivias claims to have suffered injuries and damages as a result of the accident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 129,877
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 9,723

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Joe Rivera v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC593845
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	September 4, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	David Masters
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Michael J. Gordon, Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	On September 18, 2013, an employee of the Sheriff's Department, traveling Code 3, entered the intersection of Valley Boulevard and Temple Avenue in the City of Pomona, against a red light, causing a collision with the plaintiff's vehicle. Plaintiff claims he sustained injuries to his neck, back, shoulder, abdomen, hips, left knee, left foot, and depression as a result of the accident. He claims \$40,00 in recoverable past medical expenses, \$129,000 for future medical expenses, and general damages for pain and suffering. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$100,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 67,863
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 6,632

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Donnell Thompson, Sr. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	Claim No. 16-2210
COURT	N/A - Government Tort Claim
DATE FILED	August 9, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,490,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Brian T. Dunn, Esq. The Cochran Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jonathan McCaverty Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$1,490,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a government tort claim for damages by Donnell Thompson, Sr., arising out of a July 2016 fatal deputy-involved shooting of his son, Donnell Thompson, Jr. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs; therefore, a full and final settlement of the claim in the amount of \$1,490,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 1,269
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 2,195



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:	
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<u>Donnell Thompson v. County of Los Angeles</u> Summary Corrective Action Plan 2017-005 <u>Compton Deputy Sheriffs' Traffic Stop and Pursuit</u> On July 28, 2016, at approximately 2:26 a.m., while the first deputy sheriff was working Compton Station in a marked patrol vehicle, he observed a newer model Honda vehicle traveling at a high rate of speed (a violation of 22350 CVC). As the deputy sheriff attempted to catch up to the Honda, the driver made a left turn at an intersection and failed to stop for a red traffic signal (a violation of 21450 CVC). The first deputy sheriff followed the Honda as it turned into a cul-de-sac. The Honda stopped at the end of the cul-de-sac and the first deputy sheriff performed a traffic stop on the vehicle. The first deputy sheriff attempted to detain the vehicle's driver (and only visible occupant) at gunpoint as he performed a records check on the vehicle's license plate and radioed for additional units. The records check returned and identified the Honda as a reported stolen vehicle that was taken during an armed carjacking in LAPD's Southwest Division's jurisdiction earlier in the evening. The carjacking suspect was considered "Armed and Dangerous."¹ When two additional deputy sheriffs arrived to assist with the traffic stop, the suspect vehicle accelerated forward and crashed through a chain link fence into Jefferson Elementary School. The deputy sheriffs initiated a pursuit of the vehicle through the school. The suspect vehicle crashed through another chain link fence, exited the school, and continued to flee on the city streets. While evading the deputy sheriffs by turning and swerving on city streets, the driver of the suspect vehicle used a firearm to shoot at the pursuing deputy sheriffs. The first deputy sheriff broadcast via his radio that the driver was shooting at them. After making several dangerous turns and driving maneuvers, the suspect crashed the vehicle at 2011 N. Slater Avenue (near Compton Avenue). The suspect continued to shoot at the on-scene deputy sheriffs, who in turn returned fire. During the exchange of gunfire, several deputy sheriffs moved laterally and front to back at the scene in an attempt to get into better tactical positions. A deputy sheriff advised on the radio that a male Black suspect had been seen running east from the suspect vehicle. Assisting units set up a containment east of the location, in an effort to capture the fleeing suspect.

¹ During the robbery/carjacking, one armed suspect committed the carjacking and a second suspect was thought to have assisted him in a follow vehicle.

The gunfire stopped and there was no apparent movement at the suspect vehicle. Not knowing if the suspect vehicle had any occupants, a small group of on-scene deputy sheriffs used a tactical ballistic shield and approached the suspect vehicle to clear it. As the group was about ten yards away, the suspect was found to have been lying in wait in the vehicle. The suspect suddenly jumped out of the vehicle, looked at the approaching deputy sheriffs, then sprinted away northwest from the suspect vehicle and out of view. As the suspect ran, his left hand was swinging freely as his right arm was held tightly against his body with his right hand clinched at his waist.

The suspect's location and last seen direction was broadcast over the radio and another containment was set up in an attempt to capture him.

Upon searching the suspect vehicle, the deputy sheriffs discovered the front passenger seat was laid back and the passenger side door was found to be ajar. Based on this information, coupled with the indication that another suspect had been seen running from the vehicle during the gun battle, the on-scene deputy sheriffs believed that there were two suspects who had fled from the suspect vehicle.

Special Enforcement Bureau's Involvement

At approximately 2:26 a.m., deputy sheriffs assigned to the Special Enforcement Bureau (SEB), were alerted to and began responding to the terminus of the pursuit, in the area of 2011 N. Slater Avenue, Compton. They were requested to assist deputy sheriffs assigned to Compton Station to conduct a tactical area search for an armed suspect who had fled on foot from the vehicle that had been pursued, and who had reportedly fired shots at pursuing deputy sheriffs during and upon the pursuit ending. The deputy sheriffs had last seen the armed suspect run north from the suspect vehicle and out of sight. This information, along with a suspect description, were given to responding SEB and assisting patrol deputy sheriffs.

On-scene SEB deputy sheriffs, including those assigned to the Canine Services Detail, formulated a search plan and began their search. The area to be searched was quite large and the Compton Station deputy sheriffs were unsure of the direction the suspects may have ran after they lost sight of them. Because of this, the teams divided into two search teams to be more efficient.

At 5:02 a.m., while SEB deputy sheriffs were conducting their search, deputy sheriffs assigned to Compton Station advised the SEB deputy sheriffs (via radio) of a 911 call received by the Compton Station Desk. The caller reported that there was a male Black lying in the grass in front of his house located at 831 W. Stockwell Street. The caller also said that the male appeared to possibly be injured.

Several deputy sheriffs from Compton Station responded to the Stockwell location and found the decedent (who matched the description of the outstanding suspect) lying on the grass, non-responsive to commands, but appeared to be breathing.

At 5:11 a.m., an on-scene Compton Station deputy sheriff (second deputy sheriff) advised on the radio that he could in fact see a "man down" in the front yard of 831 W. Stockwell Street and stated, "He may have a gun next

to him, on the ground.” The on-scene Compton Station deputy sheriffs contained the decedent but kept their distance, believing that he was the suspect who was being searched for and that he was armed. It was unknown why the decedent was non-responsive and lying in the grass in front of the location².

An Aero Bureau airship was overhead and verified the decedent was lying in the front yard grass area of the Stockwell Street address and that he was lying in a position where he had one of his hands tucked under his body at his waistband, and the other was by his head. They could not give any information as to his condition and could not verify whether he had been shot or injured in any other way.

Hearing that the suspect might have been located via their radios, the SEB search team assigned to search that area moved to assist the Compton Station deputy sheriffs in investigating the person who had been found. Upon arrival at 831 W. Stockwell Street, the SEB deputy sheriffs set up around the decedent, using armored vehicles for cover. They used two armored vehicles in an attempt to contain the decedent and to provide a protective barrier for the residents at the house he was laying in front of. The SEB deputy sheriffs attempted to contact the decedent and ascertain his condition.

The SEB deputy sheriffs made numerous attempts to communicate with the decedent, giving him instructions to surrender and letting him know that they would provide medical assistance if he was injured. This communication was given by unaided voice and over an amplified public address (P.A.) system. The decedent was illuminated by spotlights mounted on the armored vehicles. During this time, the decedent made no reply or attempt to communicate with any deputy sheriffs and continued to lay motionless on the ground.

With the decedent lying in a position in which it could not be determined if he was armed, and the fact that the decedent would not respond to the deputy sheriffs’ presence, the SEB deputy sheriffs elected to deploy a light and sound diversionary device³ in an attempt to elicit some type of response or reaction from the decedent. This had no effect and the decedent still laid motionless on the ground.

In a further attempt to assure that the decedent was not “lying in wait” for deputy sheriffs to approach him, a deputy sheriff assigned to SEB (third deputy sheriff) utilized a 40mm rubber baton launcher to strike the decedent in the legs and buttock area, again in attempt to elicit some type of response from the decedent. The decedent was struck twice and gave no response to being hit. When the decedent was struck a third time he finally responded by sitting up.

The decedent, now sitting up and looking at the on-scene deputy sheriffs, still failed to comply or respond to orders and instructions given to him.

² The deputy sheriffs knew that the outstanding suspect had been previously “lying in wait” at the terminus of the pursuit. A person using a ruse by hiding or acting to be injured is a known technique that can put responding deputy sheriffs in a tactical disadvantage as they approach. If the suspect lays in wait, he can sometimes fire upon first responders before they have an opportunity to defend themselves.

³ Commonly referred to as a “flash bang.”

The decedent also kept his left hand visible but had his right hand tucked near his waistband, still making it unclear if he was armed.

At approximately 5:28 a.m., the third deputy sheriff fired an additional 40mm round at the decedent, which struck him in the stomach area. In response to this round, the decedent abruptly jumped up to his feet and ran directly at the armored vehicle which was in place to block him from approaching the occupied residence he was laying in front of.

At this time, a SEB deputy sheriff (fourth deputy sheriff) standing in the turret of the armored vehicle, feared that the decedent was armed and attempting to attack him and/or the deputy sheriffs positioned behind the armored vehicle and could possibly continue past them into the occupied residence. The fourth deputy sheriff fired two rounds at the decedent from his Department issued rifle causing the decedent to fall at the base of the armored vehicle.

The decedent was then once again seen lying motionless on the ground and was unresponsive to commands and instructions. Because it was unknown if the rounds fired by the fourth deputy sheriff struck the decedent, the third deputy sheriff fired two more rounds with the 40mm rubber baton launcher at the decedent, to ensure that he was not feigning an injury and lying in wait to attack.

After the two rubber batons were fired and the decedent had no response, the arrest team approached to ascertain his condition.

It was discovered that the decedent was in fact struck by the fourth deputy sheriff's rifle rounds. Lifesaving efforts were immediately conducted by SEB/ESD paramedics but were unsuccessful. The decedent was pronounced dead at the scene. A search of his person and the immediate area revealed the decedent was unarmed.

During the incident with the decedent, it was believed, based on proximity and description, that he was the suspect who had led Compton deputy sheriffs in pursuit, shot at them during and after the pursuit, and who fled the terminus of the pursuit, disappearing into the adjacent neighborhood. It was also believed that due to the suspect's actions at the terminus of the pursuit, where he laid in wait to possibly ambush the on-scene deputy sheriffs, that the decedent could be attempting this tactic to launch a possible attack on the on-scene deputy sheriffs.

Note: Simultaneously to the deputy sheriff's contact with the decedent, a 911 hang up call was made inside the containment area. During the subsequent investigation into the call, another man matching the suspect's description was detained. The detained man was later positively identified as the suspect that had driven the suspect vehicle and shot at the deputy sheriffs. The decedent was also later positively identified as not being the suspect.

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

Departmental Cause: Based on information the suspect was armed and had shot at deputies, coupled with the decedent's erratic actions, the SEB deputy sheriff reasonably feared for his life, the lives of his partners, and the lives of the residents in the home they were protecting. The SEB deputy sheriff shot and killed the decedent prior to actually observing a weapon in the decedent's possession. The decedent was later found to be unarmed.

Non-Departmental Cause: It was found that the decedent's alcohol intoxication was approximately double California's legal driving limit. The decedent's marijuana toxicology was more than three times over the legal driving limit for states that have a five nanogram intoxication limit. The combined alcohol and marijuana intoxication may have been a factor in the decedent's impaired state.

Non-Departmental Cause: The decedent failed to follow the lawful orders and directions of the on-scene deputy sheriffs and SEB deputy sheriffs when he was not cooperative, refused to show his hands, and unexpectedly and aggressively charged towards the SEB deputy sheriffs and an occupied residence.

Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The incident is being investigated by the Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

As of this date, the investigation is on-going. When completed the case will be submitted to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for a determination as to whether the use of deadly force was legally justified.

The Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau will investigate this incident to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The California Government Code's Peace Officer Bill Of Rights sets guidelines for administrative investigation statute dates.

Once the Homicide Bureau and the Los Angeles County District Attorney Office's investigation are complete, a statute date will be set regarding the administrative investigation.

Although the second deputy sheriff from Compton Station was expressing his officer safety concerns regarding something he thought was a weapon near the decedent, his assessment of what he saw should have been expressed with more articulable content or context.

Instead of stating an assumption of what is seen, a better way to identify unknown objects is to articulate what is actually seen (example; "I see a dark colored object in the shape of a rectangle on the ground next to the suspect"). Improved articulation will assist other on-scene deputy sheriffs so that they are not predisposed with an incorrect weapon assessment.

On June 5, 2017, a Risky Business Newsletter titled "Articulation of Weapons or Unknown Objects" was distributed to all Sheriff's Department employees.

A request has been made to have a "Tip of the Week" video made to address the issue of better articulation of weapons or unknown objects. It is anticipated that the video will be produced and distributed to all Sheriff's Department personnel before December 31, 2017.

3. Are the corrective actions addressing Department-wide system issues?

- ☐ Yes – The corrective actions address Department-wide system issues.
☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)

Scott E. Johnson, Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:



Date:

7-7-17

Name: (Department Head)

Karyn Mannis, Chief
Professional Standards and Training Division

Signature:



Date:

07-10-17


Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY

Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?

☐ Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.

☒ No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this Department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General)



Signature:



Date:

7/13/2017

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Lisa Lopez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	CV 16-00098
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	January 6, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Dale K. Galipo, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$100,000 a lawsuit filed by decedent Arturo Lopez's wife Lisa Lopez, individually, and as Guardian ad litem for minors Isaiah Lopez and Zachariah Lopez, and adult child Arturo Lopez against the Sheriff's Department alleging battery, negligence, civil rights violations, and wrongful death. The Deputies claim their actions were reasonable under the circumstances. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$100,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 82,777
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 13,596

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Claim of Alicia Juarez RMIS No. 14-1113730*001
CASE NUMBER	n/a
COURT	n/a
DATE FILED	n/a
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 30,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Disability Rights California
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$30,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a claim filed by Alicia Juarez, against the Sheriff's Department ("LASD") regarding the inaccessibility of the LASD website to the visually impaired. The claim alleges that Alicia Juarez, a blind individual, has been denied access to the LASD website in violation of federal disability civil rights laws. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$30,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 22,823
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ None

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Julia Graves, et al. v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
CASE NUMBER	CV 14-08403
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	November 6, 2014
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Probation Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Lee H. Durst, Esquire The Justice Law Center
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$100,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by G.F., a minor by and through his Guardian Ad Litem, Julia Graves, against the Los Angeles County Probation Department alleging he was sexually assaulted. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$100,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 104,001
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 37,138

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Xavier H., by and through his G.A.L., Charlene Peacock v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC524503
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 14, 2014
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 95,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Sanford Jossen, Esq. Law Offices of Sanford Jossen
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jessie Lee Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	Plaintiff Xavier H. filed this action alleging that the County breached mandatory duties when the Department of Children and Family Services placed him in a foster home where he was sexually abused by a foster youth residing in the same home.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 82,304
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 9,648

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

July 17, 2017

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:30 a.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: Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Lindsay Yoshiyama, Edwin Lewis, Joseph Langton, Richard Kudo, Michael Gordon, Armita Radjabian, Catherine Mathers, and Kent Sommer; Department of Public Works: William Winter; Sheriff's Department: Joseph Dempsey, Elier Morejon, April Carter, Ralph Feroli, Eric Smitson, Holly Perez, and Dominic Dannan; Fire Department: Julia Bennett and William McCloud; Department of Parks and Recreation: David Waare, Hugo Maldonado, and Donald Limbrick; Department of Children and Family Services: Christina Lee; Department of Mental Health: David Cochran and Yanela Soulier; and Outside Counsel: Avi Burkwitz.

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.

One member 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 9:32 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(i) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 11:06 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. Non-Litigated Claim of Mario and Sandra Ramirez

This claim seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works for real and personal property damages allegedly caused from a backflow of sewage due to a sewer mainline blockage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$251,700 (includes prior payment of \$1,700).

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- b. **Angelica Iboa v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 025 998

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Fire Department flatbed truck.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$24,710.24.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- c. **Emma Hakobyan v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 514 205

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from alleged injuries received in a trip and fall accident in the picnic area of the Castaic Lake Recreation Area.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisor the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$650,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- d. **Luis Carlos Rodriguez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 587 683

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's patrol car driven by an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$75,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- e. **Harvey Amezcua v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 509 827

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's patrol car driven by an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$100,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- f. **Lloyd Joseph Collins v. State of California, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. CV 15-00710

This lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations and false imprisonment when Plaintiff was jailed overnight without a bed and denied medical treatment for his leg pain.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$270,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- g. **Gabino Rosales, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:12-CV-03852
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 546 642

This lawsuit alleges federal civil rights violations, wrongful death, negligence, and battery arising out of the death of a mentally ill inmate while incarcerated at Twin Towers Correctional Facility.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$375,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

- h. **Alison Whitman v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:16-CV-01759

This lawsuit alleges Plaintiff's civil rights were violated when the Department of Children and Family Services removed her 16-month-old son without her consent, exigent circumstances, or a warrant.

Action Taken:

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

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

i. Joseph Avery v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 605 785

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Mental Health was subjected to disability discrimination, retaliation, and that the Department failed to prevent harassment and 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 \$250,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo

5. **Approval of the minutes of the July 17, 2017, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Roger Granbo


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 11:07 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By 
Sandra C. Ruiz