



County of Los Angeles

March 17, 2026

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: 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
Yeayo Russell, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No.2:23-CV-05979



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 Russell, Yeayo, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-05979**

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation:
Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Russell, Yeayo, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-05979 in the amount of \$499,999.99 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 civil rights violations, use of excessive force, unlawful seizure and Monell liability.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| CASE NAME | Yeayo Russell, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. |
| CASE NUMBER | 2:23-CV-05979 |
| COURT | United States District Court |
| DATE FILED | July 24, 2023 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | Los Angeles County Sherriff's Department |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | \$ 499,999 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | BRADLEY GAGE Bradley Gage Law, APC. |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | RICHARD HSUEH Senior Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | <p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$499,999 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Yeayo Russell (Plaintiff) alleging excessive force.</p> <p>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 \$499,999 is recommended.</p> |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | \$ 60,332 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | \$ 8,537 |



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: | July 14, 2022 |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | <p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2024-210</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 July 13, 2022, at approximately 11:30 p.m., two on-duty Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department deputies conducted a vehicle traffic enforcement stop, for driving in darkness without headlights, in violation of California Vehicle Code Section - 24250.</p> <p>During the enforcement stop, Deputy Two and Deputy Three (the primary handling unit) noticed the Plaintiff seated in the front passenger seat holding an infant in her lap, along with two additional adult females in the backseat, with toddlers in their laps. There were no child restraint devices inside the vehicle, a violation of California Vehicle Code Section - 27360.</p> <p>Deputy Two and Deputy Three determined the young children inside the vehicle were endangered due to not being seated in child restraint devices. Deputy Two and Deputy Three decided to arrest the adult occupants inside the vehicle, including the Plaintiff, for Child Endangerment, a violation of California Penal Code Section - 273a(a) and take the children into protective custody.</p> <p>Deputy One, who was assigned to patrol, observed the traffic stop, and stopped to provide Deputy Two and Deputy Three with any assistance. Additional units were requested to the scene to assist with escorting the occupants out of the vehicle.</p> <p>Deputy Three escorted the driver, a male adult, out of the vehicle and noticed the strong odor of alcohol emitting from his person. The driver was detained in a patrol vehicle pending driving under the influence investigation.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Deputy Three escorted the Plaintiff and her infant from the vehicle and allowed them to be seated on the curb because the Plaintiff was breastfeeding.</p> <p>During the detention, deputies attempted to persuade the Plaintiff and another adult female to hand over their children to be placed into protective custody, but they refused. A supervisor was requested and Sergeant One responded to the scene. Deputies Four, Five, Six and Seven arrived along with child restraint devices for the children.</p> <p>The Plaintiff and another adult woman continued to refuse deputies to take custody of their children. Sergeant One attempted to persuade the Plaintiff and the other adult woman to surrender their children but was not able to do so. Deputy One and Deputy Five used a control hold on the adult woman to take custody of her child and to physically place her under arrest. Deputy Two was able to take custody of the woman's child and secure her into the car seat of the patrol vehicle. Deputy One and Deputy Five escorted the woman to the backseat of the patrol vehicle.</p> <p>Sergeant One continued talking to the Plaintiff, who was holding her infant in her arms, in an attempt to gain compliance to take her child into protective custody. After several minutes and no cooperation, Deputy Two and Deputy Three began to use control holds on the Plaintiff in an attempt to take custody of the infant. The Plaintiff began to scream and move her body around, nearly striking the infant's head on a nearby vehicle. The deputies gave the Plaintiff multiple verbal commands to release the baby, or she might harm him. As Deputy Two and Deputy Three used control holds on the Plaintiff, she began to scream that deputies were breaking her baby's leg. The Plaintiff pinned the infant between herself and the vehicle. Deputy One saw the only one touching the baby's legs was the Plaintiff. Fearing the Plaintiff would cause great bodily injury to the child's legs or head, Deputy One struck the Plaintiff in the face with his fist twice and gave her a verbal command to let go of the baby. The Plaintiff loosened her grip of the baby and Deputy One was able to take custody of the infant. Deputy One secured the infant into a child seat in the patrol vehicle. Deputy Two and Deputy Three took the Plaintiff into custody and escorted her to the back seat of the patrol vehicle.</p> <p>Los Angeles County Fire was then requested to respond over the radio.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>A Los Angeles County Paramedics Unit arrived, however, the Plaintiff declined medical treatment. Deputies transported the Plaintiff to be medically cleared for booking at a local hospital.</p> <p>Deputy Two and Deputy Three took three children into protective custody, pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 300 (W.I.C). Deputy Two and Deputy Three subsequently arrested two adult females, the male adult driver, and the Plaintiff for Child Endangerment, a violation of Penal Code Section 273a (a). The Plaintiff and one adult female were additionally charged with Resisting an Officer, a violation of Penal Code Section 148 (a)(1). The driver, a male adult was additionally arrested for Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol, a violation of California Vehicle Code Section - 23152 (a).</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services responded to the station and took custody of the three children.</p> <p>No deputies were injured during this incident.</p> <p>Deputy personnel involved in this incident were wearing and activated their body worn cameras, in accordance with Department protocol.</p> |
|--|---|

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

| |
|--|
| <p>A Department root cause in this incident was Deputy One used unreasonable force when he punched the Plaintiff in the face causing injury.</p> <p>A Department root cause in this incident was Sergeant One failed to perform to Department Standards and allowed this incident to progress into a significant use of force.</p> <p>A Department root cause in this incident was Deputy One's failure to de-escalate.</p> <p>A non-associated root cause in this incident was the handling deputy did not document the Plaintiff's statements regarding not having parental custody of her child.</p> <p>A non-Department root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff refused to cooperate during a child endangerment investigation.</p> |
|--|

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

Criminal Investigation

This incident was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff Department's Internal Criminal Investigation's Bureau and Federal Bureau of Investigations to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred. The FBI concluded their investigation and declined to file criminal charges.

Criminal Investigation – Two

This incident has been investigated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Internal Criminal Investigation 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 filing consideration.

Administrative Investigation

This incident was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Unit to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident.

Executive evaluation of this incident found Deputy One and Sergeant One's actions were in violation of Department Policy. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

Both Deputy One and Sergeant One were assessed additional Department training.

Station Debriefing (Use of Force / De-escalation)

This incident continues to be briefed periodically to patrol during shift briefings by sergeants. Topics include the following:

- Dealing with difficult persons
- Requesting supervisors
- Considerations for taking children into protective custody
- Use of Force – Personal Weapons
- De-escalation techniques

In an effort to provide additional training, station personnel have continued to attend Arrest and Control / Use of Force training.

In 2023, 5 station employees completed Arrest and Control / Use of Force training. In 2024, 124 station employees completed the course and in 2025, 45 have completed the training with 10 employees scheduled later in the year.

In 2024, the station sent 7 station employees to force instructor school to assist with use of force training. There are no employee' scheduled in 2025, due to no classes being offered.

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) | |
| Tri Hoang, Captain Risk Management Bureau | |
| Signature:  | Date: 10.24.25 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Name: (Department Head) | |
| Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations | |
| Signature:  | Date: 11/5/25 |

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: 11/10/25 |