

JOHN F. KRATTLI County Counsel

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

March 19, 2014

TELEPHONE (213) 974-1861 FACSIMILE (213) 229-9924 TDD (213) 633-0901

TO:

SACHI A. HAMAI

Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors

Attention: Agenda Preparation

FROM:

PATRICK A. WU

Senior Assistant County Counsel

RE:

Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda

County Claims Board Recommendation

Hesham Sultan v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 478 066

Attached is the Agenda entry for the Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation regarding the above-referenced matter. Also attached are the Case Summary and the Summary Corrective Action Plan to be made available to the public.

It is requested that this recommendation, the Case Summary and the Summary Corrective Action Plan be placed on the Board of Supervisors' agenda.

PAW:rfm

Attachments

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled <u>Hesham Sultan v. County of Los Angeles</u>, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 478 066, in the amount of \$975,000 and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This lawsuit alleges assault, battery, and negligence by an off-duty Sheriff's Deputy.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME

Hesham Sultan vs. County of Los

Angeles, et. al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 478066

COURT

Los Angeles Superior Court

DATE FILED

January 31, 2012

COUNTY DEPARTMENT

Sheriff's Department

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

\$ 975,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

David Wood, Esq.

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY

Millicent L. Rolon

NATURE OF CASE

Plaintiff Hesham Sultan alleges that he was unlawfully shot by a Sheriff's Deputy and suffered serious injuries as a result.

The Deputy contends that he was in fear for his life when he fired the shots at Mr. Sultan.

Due to the risks and uncertainties of the 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 \$975,000 is recommended.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE

\$ 197,045

PAID COSTS, TO DATE

\$ 38,693

Case Name: Hesham Sultan 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;	Wednesday, June 22, 2011; approximately 4:30 a.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Hesham Sultan V. County of Los Angeles, et al. Summary Corrective Action Plan No. 2013-038
	On Wednesday, June 22, 2011, at approximately 4:30 a.m., an off-duty Los Angeles County deputy sheriff, assigned to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Communication and Fleet Management Bureau, was driving his personal vehicle south on the Golden State (5) Freeway near the Ventura (134) Freeway.
	in his rearylew mirror, the deputy sheriff saw the plaintiff's vehicle approaching at a high rate of speed. The deputy opined the driver was operating his vehicle in a reckless manner and suspected he may be under the influence. The deputy sheriff called the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department's Compton Station to report his observations. He then telephoned the California Highway Patrol to report that the plaintiff was driving erratically.
	The plaintiff exited the freeway a short time later. The deputy sheriff followed the plaintiff's vehicle onto a side street where the plaintiff made a U-turn and began travelling northbound in the southbound travel lane directly at the deputy sheriff's vehicle. After the plaintiff stopped his vehicle next to the deputy sheriff's vehicle and rolled down the directly window, the deputy sheriff discharged his weapon, striking the plaintiff.

Briefly describe the <u>root cause(s)</u> of the claim/lawsuit:

The root cause in this incident was the deployment of deadly force by a member of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

This section intentionally left blank.

Document version: 4.0 (January 2013)

 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 addresses the circumstances which occurred in the incident.

This incident was thoroughly investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau. The results of their investigation were presented to representatives from the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. On December 5, 2013, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office closed their file and took no action.

The incident is now being investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau. Since the investigation is still active, the results are not yet known.

On or before **September 30, 2014**, this corrective action plan will be supplemented with a report to include 1) the results of the administrative investigation; 2) any administrative action taken or discipline imposed; and, 3) any other corrective action measures identified and/or taken.

- 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

Date: 2-6-14
Date:
2-19-14

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector Go Are the corrective gottons applicable arother departments	
New the expressive autions potentially have double to the corrective actions are applicable only to	gy-wide applicability this department
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature:	Date:
Det Costo	2/20/2014