



County of Los Angeles

November 4, 2025

Dawyn R. Harrison
County Counsel

Board of Supervisors

Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor, First District

Holly 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

Attention: Agenda Preparation

FROM: ADRIENNE M. BYERS
Litigation Cost Manager

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'AMB'.

RE: **Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda**
County Claims Board Recommendation
Enzo Escalante v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-cv-02590



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 Summary Corrective Action Plan to be made available to the public.

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

AMB:lzs

Attachments

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled Enzo Escalante v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:22-cv-02590, in the amount of \$295,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This federal civil rights lawsuit against the Sheriff's Department alleges excessive force arising from an incident that occurred during Plaintiff's detention.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Enzo Escalante v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-CV-02590
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	April 19, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 295,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Justin Sterling, Law Offices of Justin Sterling and Erin Darling, Law Offices of Erin Darling
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Minas Samuelian Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$295,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Enzo Escalante ("Plaintiff"), alleging excessive force. Given the high 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 \$295,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 153,155
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 3,565



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:	March 10, 2021 approximately at 8:30 a.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2024-195 Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident. Multiple investigative reports indicate on March 10, 2021, Deputy One and Deputy Two were assigned to a Los Angeles County Courthouse. At approximately 0820 hours, Deputies One and Two along with Department personnel searched approximately 15 inmates in the lockup area in preparation for their court appearances. The inmates being searched were not handcuffed and lined up along the walls of the lockup area. During the search, the Plaintiff and another man spoke to each other, against verbal orders to stop by Deputies. Deputy One intended to verbally counsel him the Plaintiff. He ordered The Plaintiff to stand and face the wall, where he intended to wait until other inmates had passed where he would speak to the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff turned around, swung his fist, and punched Deputy One in the face. Deputy One stated he was shocked, dizzy, and disoriented from the strike; he suffered a cut lip. Deputy One punched the Plaintiff in the face, grabbed his shirt, and used his right bent knee to strike the Plaintiff in the upper torso. An inmate approached Deputy One and the Plaintiff as they were engaged in a fight. Deputy One and other Deputies on scene formed the opinion the inmate attempted to assist the Plaintiff in the fight and possibly assault Deputy One. Deputies used control techniques and placed the other man against an adjacent wall as the Plaintiff punched Deputy One again on the left side of his head. Deputy Two wrapped his arms around the Plaintiff's chest. The Plaintiff was taken to the ground by Deputy One and Deputy Two. The Plaintiff fell first to his knees, and then fell chest-down on the floor. The Plaintiff pushed his body upward. Deputy One believed the Plaintiff was attempting to get up and assault him. Deputy Three arrived and placed his knee on the Plaintiff's left shoulder and back area. Deputy One used his shins and knees to pin down the Plaintiff's head and neck in order to keep his hands free to handcuff the Plaintiff, and he did not want to risk being bitten by the Plaintiff. Deputy

	One and other Deputies feared a large-scale attack on deputies was underway by the unsecured inmates. The Plaintiff moved around as Deputies attempted to control and handcuff him. Deputies Two and Three placed the Plaintiff's hands behind his back and handcuffed him. The Plaintiff did not resist any further. Deputy Two injured his groin during the handcuffing and disengaged from the incident to seek medical care. Deputy One maintained control of the Plaintiff on the ground. Deputy Four used her hands to hold the Plaintiff's legs while Deputy Five applied the hobble restraint, unresisted. Deputy One stated that once the Plaintiff was handcuffed, he shifted his weight off The Plaintiff's head and body. Deputy One remained crouched over the Plaintiff and monitored him. Deputy One left his right leg in contact with the Plaintiff's head and neck, but no longer applied pressure or weight onto the leg. Deputy One did not observe any labored breathing, sign of distress nor complaint of pain. The Plaintiff stated the deputy's knee was on his head. The Plaintiff stated that he told deputies he had difficulty breathing, and they released the pressure on him. A sergeant arrived, and the Plaintiff was placed onto a safety chair without resistance.
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was a Deputy Sheriff-involved use of force incident.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was a Deputy Sheriff physically engaged an uncooperative and/or argumentative inmate.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the supervising deputy sheriffs who were present did not intervene in the use of force.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was a Deputy Sheriff failed to reassess the force used once the Plaintiff was handcuffed and no longer combative or resistive.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was a Deputy Sheriff failed to place the Plaintiff in a recovery position once he was subdued and/or handcuffed.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the initial decision by Department Executive(s) to not present the criminal complaint against the Plaintiff to the District Attorney's Office for filing consideration.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff refused to comply with the lawful orders given by a Deputy Sheriff.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's assault on a Deputy Sheriff.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

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

This use-of-force was investigated by the Sheriff's Department's Internal Criminal Investigations Bureau to determine if any Department policy violations occurred during the use or reporting of force used against the Plaintiff. The results of the investigation were presented to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for evaluation and filing consideration.

On November 15, 2022, the District Attorney's Office concluded there was insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Deputy One committed the crime of assault under the color of authority and declined to initiate criminal proceedings against him.

On March 3, 2023, the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigation into this matter was concluded. This case was subsequently reviewed by the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC), who determined the following:

The EFRC Committee determined the force used in this incident was out of policy and appropriate administrative action was taken.

Deputies involved in this incident received additional training pertaining to the circumstances surrounding this incident.

Court Services West Bureau Debriefing (Tactical and Mental Health)

In the days following the incident, Courthouse supervisors briefed on the events known at the time. Court Services personnel were briefed on Managing Uncooperative, Argumentative, or Highly Emotional Persons with a special emphasis on the responsibilities of requesting a sergeant.

Additional focus was placed on officer safety, tactical preparedness, and lessons learned to assist employees if they ever find themselves in a similar situation.

Briefings have continued on a quarterly basis by Court Services West Bureau supervisors to reiterate the Department's expectations and policies.

Filing Criminal Complaints

The Department has instituted training at various levels of supervision to enhance transparency and emphasize the adherence to policy and standardized procedures in all instances, including high profile cases that have or may garner media attention.

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 M. Valdes, Acting Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 08/19/25

Name: (Department Head) Jason A. Skeen, Assistant Sheriff Countywide Operations	
Signature: 	Date: 8/20/25

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: 8/21/2025