



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

DAWYN R. HARRISON  
County Counsel

February 27, 2024

TELEPHONE  
(213) 974-1885  
FACSIMILE  
(213) 626-2105  
TDD  
(213) 633-0901  
E-MAIL  
abyers@counsel.lacounty.gov

**ADOPTED**

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

72 February 27, 2024

TO: JEFF LEVINSON  
Interim Executive Officer  
Board of Supervisors

Attention: Agenda Preparation

FROM: ADRIENNE M. BYERS  
Litigation Cost Manager  
Executive Office

JEFF LEVINSON  
INTERIM EXECUTIVE OFFICER

RE: **Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda**  
**County Claims Board Recommendation**  
**Julio C. Blandon Alvarado v. Los Angeles County, et al.**  
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case Number 21STCV18550**

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.

AMB:ds

Attachments

## Board Agenda

### MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled Julio C. Blandon Alvarado v. Los Angeles County, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case Number: 21STCV18550, in the amount of \$175,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This lawsuit arises from injuries allegedly sustained in an automobile accident involving a Sheriff's Department lieutenant.

## **CASE SUMMARY**

### **INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION**

CASE NAME	Julio C. Bandon Alvarado v. Los Angeles County, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV18550
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	May 18, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 175,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	DARIO C. GOMEZ, ESQ. Law Offices of Jacob Emrani, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	ADRIAN G. GRAGAS Assistant County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This case involves a motor vehicle accident that occurred in Los Angeles on May 22, 2019, when a Sheriff's Lieutenant made an unsafe merge in stop-and-go traffic, and collided with Plaintiff Julio Bandon's vehicle. Plaintiff alleges he was injured and sustained damages and filed suit.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 15,011
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 26,901

**Case Name:**

Alvarado, Julio C. Blandon v. County of Los Angeles

County of Los Angeles

Summary Corrective Action Plan

**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 22, 2019
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Plaintiff alleges various injuries and property damage arising out of a traffic collision involving an on-duty Deputy Sheriff.</p> <p>On May 22, 2019, the involved employee was driving an unmarked Dodge Charger vehicle northbound on Riverside Drive in the City of Los Angeles. At the time, traffic was stop and go and the road was wet due to rain.</p> <p>The lane the employee was traveling in ended, requiring the employee to merge. The employee turned his head toward the lane he was attempting to merge into. When the employee looked forward again, they realized traffic ahead of them had come to a full stop.</p> <p>The employee attempted to stop their vehicle, but was unable to avoid a collision. Their estimated speed at the time of the collision was 10-15 MPH.</p> <p>The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) responded and took a traffic collision report. LAPD determined the employee was at fault for following too closely.</p>

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

A Departmental root cause in this incident was the involved employee driving in a manner that violated the California Vehicle Code.

**Case Name:**

Alvarado, Julio C. Blandon v. County of Los Angeles

County of Los Angeles

Summary Corrective Action Plan

**2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:**

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

- Traffic Collision Investigation – The incident was thoroughly investigated by the LAPD. LAPD determined the involved employee was primarily responsible for the accident.
- Supervisor's Report of Incident or Damage to County Vehicle – A thorough administrative investigation was conducted of the incident. Appropriate administrative action was taken.
- Employee Risk Assessment – A comprehensive review of the involved deputy sheriff's work history was conducted after this incident. This review included uses of force, civil claims, and complaints, as well as traffic collisions. The review also noted the involved employee was exempt from biannual driving refresh training due to their rank and division of assignment (custody).
- Training – The involved employee's unit commander recommended an 8-hour driving course as a result of this incident. The recommended course was curtailed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)  
Commander Tania E. Plunkett

Signature:



Date:

6-14-23

Name: (Department Head)  
Chief Paula L. Tokar

Signature:



Date:

6/21/23

**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: