



County of Los Angeles

October 14, 2025

Dawyn R. Harrison
County Counsel

Board of Supervisors

Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor, First District


Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor, Second District

Lindsey P. Horvath
Supervisor, Third District

Janice Hahn
Supervisor, Fourth District

Kathryn Barger
Supervisor, Fifth District

TO: EDWARD YEN
Executive Officer
Board of Supervisors

FROM: TIMOTHY J. KRAL 
Assistant County Counsel
Justice and Safety Division

RE: **Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda**
County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund
Claims Board Recommendation
Abelar, Adrian v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No.2:23-CV-01606



Attached is the Agenda entry for the Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation in the above-referenced matter. Also attached is the Case Summary and the Summary Corrective Action Plan for the case.

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

TJK:as

Attachment

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Settlement for Matter Entitled Abelar, Adrian v. County of Los Angeles, et al. United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-01606.

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation:
Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled **Abelar, Adrian v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-01606 in the amount of \$700,000 and instruct the
Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's
Department Contract Cities Trust Fund's budget.

This lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations, excessive force, unreasonable search and seizure, conspiracy, Monell violations and failure to supervise which arose from a Sheriff's Deputy involved shooting.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	<u>Abelar, Adrian v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u>
CASE NUMBER	2:23-CV-01606
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	March 6, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 700,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	THOMAS E. BECK, ESQ. The Beck Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MILLICENT L. ROLON Principal Deputy County Counsel THOMAS C. HURRELL Hurrell & Cantrall, LLP
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$700,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Adrian Abelar after he was shot by a Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Deputy.</p> <p>Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. The full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$700,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 153,069
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 66,450



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:	October 19, 2021, approximately 4:50 pm.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Summary Corrective Action Plan 2023-178</p> <p>Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.</p> <p>Based on multiple investigative reports, on October 19, 2021, at approximately 4:50 p.m., Deputies One and Two were dispatched to a business disturbance call involving the Plaintiff.</p> <p>Approximately 50 minutes later, a call was received by dispatch a second time because deputies had not arrived to the location.</p> <p>Deputies One and Two arrived to the location and observed the Plaintiff sitting in the driver's seat, and a female (the Plaintiff's girlfriend) sitting in the front passenger's seat.</p> <p>Deputy One contacted the Plaintiff on the driver's side while Deputy Two contacted the Plaintiff's girlfriend on the passenger's side.</p> <p>Deputy Two asked the Plaintiff and the girlfriend if they had identification and to hand it to Deputy One. The Plaintiff said he gave his identification to the business attendant. Deputy One obtained the names and birth dates of the Plaintiff and girlfriend; however, Deputy One misspelled the Plaintiff's name. Deputy One used his portable radio to conduct a record check/wanted person's inquiry via the Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC). SCC advised the name and date of birth provided did not return to an identification; however, there was a near match to the name, but the near match was with a different spelling.</p> <p>Deputy One again asked the Plaintiff for identification and the Plaintiff told Deputy One the business attendant had his</p>

	<p>identification. An assisting unit arrived to the location. The assisting deputy contacted the business attendant and asked for the Plaintiff's identification. The attendant told her the Plaintiff never gave him any identification. The assisting deputy took a position near the rear of the vehicle and advised Deputy One the business attendant did not have the Plaintiff's identification.</p> <p>Deputy One became suspicious of the Plaintiff and thought he was attempting to conceal his identity. Deputy One asked the Plaintiff to exit the vehicle. The Plaintiff complied as Deputy One opened the driver's door.</p> <p>As the Plaintiff exited the vehicle, the Plaintiff was holding a semi-automatic handgun in his right hand and a brief struggle ensued. Deputy One yelled, "Gun, gun, he's got a gun!" The Plaintiff tossed the handgun away from him and Deputy One.</p> <p>Both Deputy One and the Plaintiff fell to the ground. The Plaintiff held his arms out, away from his sides. Deputy One did not see the Plaintiff throw the handgun and believed the Plaintiff was still armed. Deputy One unholstered his firearm and fired one round, striking the Plaintiff in the upper back area.</p> <p>Deputy One immediately broadcasted he was involved in a shooting and requested additional units to the location. The Los Angeles County Fire Department was also requested. Deputies One and Two monitored the Plaintiff to ensure he was breathing, and the Plaintiff was placed into a recovery position.</p> <p>Deputy Two and a responding deputy provided first aid to the Plaintiff by removing his shirt and applying pressure to the gunshot wound.</p> <p>The Fire Department responded and subsequently assumed medical care of the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff was transported to the hospital and received further medical treatment.</p> <p>Homicide Detectives arrived and took command of the scene and investigation.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One was unaware the Plaintiff threw his firearm and was no longer in possession of it.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two's failure to contact the suspect as a high-risk suspect based on the information provided by the caller.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One used deadly force.

A **non-Associated Department** root cause in this incident was the original call from the informant was dispatched as a routine call instead of a priority call.

A **non-Department** root cause was the Plaintiff was uncooperative and struggled with Deputy One immediately as he exited the vehicle causing Deputy One to utilize control holds and believe the suspect was a threat.

A **non-Department** root cause was the Plaintiff was in possession of a firearm when he exited the vehicle.

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

Critical Incident Review

The Critical Incident Review panel (CIRP) reviewed the incident and required the deputies involved to attend additional training.

Criminal and Administrative Investigation

An administrative investigation will be completed once JSID has made a filing determination.

Tactical Debriefing

This incident was critically debriefed with the involved deputy sheriffs regarding the events known at the time. Special focus was placed on officer safety, tactical preparedness, and lessons learned to assist employees if they ever find themselves in a similar situation.

Station Training

Deputy Sheriffs assigned to the station will continuously be scheduled to attend critical incident training with the Department's Tactics and Survival unit and Force Training Unit.


Department-certified force and tactics instructors teach blocks of Arrest and Control Techniques and tactics on a regular basis, with an emphasis on de-escalation tactics.

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) Julia Valdes, A/Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 07/03/2025

Name: (Department Head) Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature: 	Date: 7/15/25

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: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: 	Date: 7/18/2025