



ADOPTED

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

56 December 2, 2025

County of Los Angeles

December 2, 2025

Dawyn R. Harrison
County Counsel

EDWARD YEN
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

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: JOSEPH M. NICCHITTA
Acting Chief Executive Officer

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
Salvador Garcia, et al v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV00967.



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 Salvador Garcia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV00967.

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation: Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled **Salvador Garcia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.** Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV00967 in the amount of \$1,250,000 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 and state civil rights violations, negligence, assault and battery, negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress arising from a fatal shooting involving Sheriff's Deputies.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Salvador Garcia, et al., County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	20STCV00967
COURT	Los Angeles County Superior Court
DATE FILED	January 9, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	FRANK PEREZ MIGUEL CABALLERO Perez & Caballero
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	RICHARD HSUEH Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle the federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Salvador Garcia, Ana Maria Garcia, and Ana Morales arising from the deputy-involved fatal shooting of Pablo Garcia on May 21, 2019, for a sum of \$1,250,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs.</p> <p>Due to 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 \$1,250,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 465,924
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 85,780



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 21, 2019
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Summary Corrective Action Pan 2024-226</p> <p>Based on multiple investigative reports, on May 21, 2019, the Decedent got into an argument with his parents, Plaintiff One and Plaintiff Two, due to his excessive drinking, drug use, and violent behavior. Plaintiff Two contacted Plaintiff Three by phone to express concerns regarding the Decedent's violent behavior. Plaintiff Two told Plaintiff Three, she was the only one who could effectively speak to the Decedent. Plaintiff Two requested Plaintiff Three to respond to the residence to calm the Decedent down.</p> <p>Plaintiff Three arrived at her parents' residence. The Decedent was inside the residence, yelling and screaming. Plaintiff Three was able to calm him down and get him to exit the residence and enter the garage. Plaintiff Three remained with the Decedent in the garage and offered to help him clean. Plaintiff Three exited the garage and reentered the residence. Shortly thereafter, the Decedent returned to the main residence and resumed arguing with Plaintiff One and Plaintiff Two.</p> <p>As the Decedent was arguing with Plaintiff One and Two, he grabbed Plaintiff Three by her hair, pushed her against a wall and raised his fist towards her. The Decedent then released Plaintiff Three, and she continued to try and calm him down. The Decedent became irate, picked up a computer monitor, and threw it to the floor, causing it to shatter. Plaintiff Three realized she could not control the Decedent and told Plaintiff Two she wanted to call the police. Plaintiff Two, visibly upset and scared, agreed to call the police.</p> <p>At approximately 12:27 p.m., Plaintiff Three placed a 9-1-1 call regarding a family disturbance.</p> <p>The station dispatcher dispatched patrol units to the residence.</p>

	<p>Deputies Three and Four, (a two-man unit) were the primary unit assigned to the call for service. While responding to the location, Deputy Four coordinated the assisting units via a tactical radio channel. Deputy Five (an assisting unit) and Deputy Two (an assisting unit) were directed to meet west of the location, pending Deputies Three and Four's arrival. Deputy Two indicated he had a conducted energy weapon (CEW), previously known as Taser. The units acknowledged Deputy Four's instructions, and Deputy Two advised he would be arriving at the location in seconds along with Deputy One (an assisting unit).</p> <p>Deputy One was the first to arrive on scene and parked just west of the residence, as directed by Deputy Four. Deputy One saw all three Plaintiff's standing in the front yard. The Plaintiffs saw Deputy One and waved him over to contact them. Deputy One approached and spoke to Plaintiff Three from the sidewalk in front of the home.</p> <p>Plaintiff Three informed Deputy One the Decedent was acting erratically, throwing items, pushing family members, and threatening them. She also told Deputy One the Decedent was inside the garage and had a knife, but she had already taken it and hid it in the garage. During their discussion, Plaintiff One went into the residence, and Plaintiff Two opened the driveway gate.</p> <p>Deputy Two arrived at the location and parked his patrol vehicle just south of Deputy One's patrol vehicle. Deputy One was already speaking to Plaintiff Three.</p> <p>Deputy Two exited his patrol vehicle and checked the southeast side of the residence and the front the residence to make notes of any possible avenues to approach the Decedent and/or any possible exits Decedent could utilize.</p> <p>Deputy Two then returned to his patrol vehicle to retrieve his CEW. The Decedent exited a door located between the residence and garage. The Decedent had a glass bottle in his right hand and a large framing hammer, approximately 16 to 20 inches in length, in his left hand. The Decedent walked towards Plaintiff Three at a rapid pace, called her a "f**king bi**h", and stated he was going to kill her.</p> <p>Deputy One feared the Decedent was going to kill or cause significant bodily injury to Plaintiff Three. Recognizing the fence as a physical barrier which prevented him from</p>
--	--

	<p>moving forward to protect her, Deputy One attempted to draw the Decedent's attention away from Plaintiff Three and towards himself. From approximately ten feet, Deputy One drew his firearm at the Decedent and ordered him to stop and drop the hammer. The Decedent's attention was diverted to Deputy One.</p> <p>There was an open driveway gate at the end of the fence. Deputy One walked northbound towards the driveway gate to draw the Decedent away from Plaintiff Three. The Decedent, now solely focused on Deputy One, walked towards Deputy One at a rapid pace while holding the hammer and liquor bottle above his waist. The Decedent yelled at Deputy One, "You f**king pig, I'm going to kill you!" Deputy One repeatedly commanded the Decedent to stop and drop the hammer, but the Decedent refused to comply with Deputy One's verbal commands.</p> <p>Deputy Two heard the yelling and screaming. Deputy Two retrieved his CEW from the front seat and approached the location. Deputy One continued issuing verbal commands for the Decedent to drop the hammer, but he did not comply. Fearing for his life, Deputy One aimed at the Decedent's center mass and fired two rounds from his Department-issued Smith & Wesson M&P 9mm duty firearm. The two rounds struck the Decedent. The impact had little to no effect as he continued walking aggressively toward Deputy One.</p> <p>This prompted Deputy One to fire one additional round at the Decedent's center mass, which had the intended effect. The Decedent stopped walking, dropped the liquor bottle and hammer, bent forward and fell to the ground. Deputy One fired a total of three rounds.</p> <p>Deputy One approached the Decedent and kicked the hammer out of his reach. Deputy One then knelt down beside the Decedent to secure him in handcuffs but felt the Decedent's arm become rigid and pull away. With Deputy Two's assistance, Deputy One was able to successfully secure the Decedent in handcuffs. Deputy Two immediately transmitted over his Department-issued handheld radio, a Deputy involved shooting had occurred and requested emergency medical personnel to the scene.</p> <p>The Decedent was positioned on his side while waiting for the arrival of emergency medical personnel. As he was</p>
--	---

	<p>positioned to his side, the Decedent looked up, stared Deputy One in the eyes, and told him, "That's what I wanted. I wanted you to kill me." The Decedent then lost consciousness.</p> <p>Los Angeles County Fire Department arrived on scene along with a McCormick Ambulance unit. Emergency medical personnel provided medical treatment to the Decedent, rendering life-saving measures while preparing him for transport. The Decedent was transported to the hospital, where he succumbed to his injuries and was pronounced deceased.</p>
--	--

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the use of deadly force by Deputy One.

A **Department** root cause identified in this incident was Deputy One's decision to prematurely engage in the family call for service instead of waiting for the arrival of the handling unit and/or additional units, as instructed.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One's failure to broadcast emergent information to responding units and to broadcast the Decedent's volatile actions.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One's closing the distance between him and the Decedent prior to assisting units and the field sergeants' arrival.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Two's failure to have his assigned conducted energy weapon readily available.

A **Department** root cause was the deputy sheriffs were not equipped with Body-Worn Cameras. Body-Worn camera footage would have captured the deputy sheriff's contact/interaction with the decedent/plaintiffs, which could have potentially proved or disproved the plaintiffs' allegations.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Decedent's failure to comply with the lawful orders issued by Deputy One.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Decedent's decision to make an assaultive approach towards Deputy One with a hammer and glass bottle in his hands.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Decedent's use of narcotics and alcohol, which led to an altered state of mind and hostile behavior.

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

Criminal Investigation

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

The investigation was submitted to the Justice System Integrity Division (JSID) of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for consideration of filing criminal charges. The Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office informed the Department of their findings, stating that the homicide of the Decedent by Deputy One was not unlawful and was a reasonable response given the circumstances surrounding the incident.

Administrative Investigation

After the District Attorney's Office completed its findings, the Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigated the incident, which was reviewed by the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) Panel to assess whether the tactics and force used were within policy. It was determined that the force used by Deputies One and Two was within Department policy. However, some of the tactics employed were not in compliance with Department policy. Appropriate administrative action was taken and both Deputies One and Two received additional training.

Station Briefings/ Issuance of Tasers

Sworn personnel are continuously briefed on the Manual of Policy and Procedures Sections 3-10/118.00 – Performance to Standards – Use of Force, 3-01/030.10 – Obedience to Laws, Regulations, and Orders, and 5-06/045.00 – Conducted Energy Weapon (CEW). These briefings are conducted by the line sergeants and lieutenants.

As of July 2025, the station trained and assigned Taser 10s to approximately 98% of the available personnel assigned to patrol.

Station Body Worn Camera

As of October 2020, all personnel were issued a Body Worn Camera (BWC) in an effort to ensure all public contact is transparent. The use of BWCs ensures reliable recording of enforcement and investigative contacts with the public. The Department established policies and procedures for the purpose, use, and deployment of the Department issued BWCs.


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: 08/21/25

Name: (Department Head)	
Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature: 	Date: 9/15/25

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this Department.	
Name: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: 	Date: 9/18/25