



County of Los Angeles

April 14, 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
Ursula Byram, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-09285**



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 Ursula Byram, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-09285**

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation: Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Ursula Byram, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-09285 in the amount of \$6,500,000 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, use of excessive force, denial of medical care, interference with familiar relationship, *Monell* liability, violation of ADA, false imprisonment, battery, negligence, violation of Bane Act which arising from the fatal shooting involving Sheriff's deputies.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| CASE NAME | Ursula Byram, et al v. County of Los Angeles, et al. |
| CASE NUMBER | 2:23-CV-9285 |
| COURT | United States District Court |
| DATE FILED | November 3, 2023 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | Sheriff's Department |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | \$ 6,500,000 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | DALE K. GALIPO, ESQ. Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | RICHARD HSUEH, ESQ. Senior Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | <p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$6,500,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Ursula Byram and her three minor children (Plaintiffs) alleging excessive force.</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 is the amount of \$6,500,000 is recommended.</p> |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | \$ 238,017 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | \$ 71,769 |



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: | February 10, 2023, at approximately 10:22 p.m. |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | <p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-232</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 February 10, 2023, at approximately 10:11 p.m., three on-duty Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Deputy Sheriffs responded to a residence for a domestic violence call for service. The call indicated the Plaintiff's husband (Decedent) was hitting her and placed her in a headlock. The call also indicated the Decedent was intoxicated but not armed. The call was updated, to the Decedent was heard stating, "suicide by cop", and he took psychiatric medication.</p> <p>Deputies One, Two and Three arrived at the residence first and contacted the Plaintiff at the front door of the residence. The Plaintiff reported the Decedent was mentally ill, suicidal, intoxicated, and assaulted her. The Plaintiff wanted the Decedent to be admitted into the hospital because he tried slicing his throat in front of her. The Plaintiff believed the Decedent left the residence but was not certain.</p> <p>Shortly thereafter, Sergeants One and Two arrived. Deputies One, Two, Three and Sergeant One entered the residence to conduct a protective sweep and search for the Decedent while Sergeant Two remained with the Plaintiff in front of the residence. The Decedent was not located inside of the residence.</p> <p>At approximately 10:22 p.m., Deputies One, Two, Three and Sergeant One entered the backyard of the residence, searching for the Decedent. Deputies One and Two approached the side yard where the Decedent appeared from behind a wooden fence with a sword. Deputies One and Two detained the Decedent at gunpoint while stating, "let me see your hands!" The Decedent raised the sword</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>and stated, “f*****g f*****t, shoot me n****r, shoot me f*****t.” Deputy One advised he had a 40mm less than lethal weapon and he transitioned from his service weapon to the less lethal. Deputy Two told Deputy Three and Sergeant One, the Decedent had a sword. Sergeant One asked, “who has Taser, who has Taser!” Deputy Three approached the side yard, with his service weapon drawn, and briefly drew his taser from the holster with his opposite hand but quickly put the Taser back into the holster.</p> <p>Deputy Three monitored the Decedent from over a wooden fence while holding him at gunpoint. Sergeant One used his Department-issued radio and broadcast they were detaining a person with a knife at gunpoint. Deputies One, Two and Three gave multiple verbal commands for the Decedent to “drop the sword!” The Decedent raised the sword and swung it up and down across the front of his body as he walked toward the deputies. Deputy One announced “40, 40.” Deputy Three was terrified the Decedent would stab him or one of the other deputies, so he fired his Department-issued weapon, striking the Decedent in the head. Deputy One, almost simultaneously, fired one 40mm less lethal foam round striking the Decedent in the chest. The Decedent fell to the ground on his right side with the sword partially underneath him.</p> <p>Deputy Three announced “998” over his Department-issued radio. Deputies One, Two, Three and Sergeant One approached the Decedent while Sergeant One provided their location over the radio. Deputy One removed the sword from underneath the Decedent. Sergeant One immediately requested the Los Angeles Fire Department to respond over his Department-issued radio. Under the direction of Sergeant One, Deputy One checked the Decedent for a pulse on his left carotid artery, none was found, and he began Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (CPR).</p> <p>Deputies Four and Five arrived and contacted the Plaintiff in front of the residence who was holding an infant. The Plaintiff advised Deputy Four there was another child inside the residence sleeping. Deputies Four and Five escorted the Plaintiff and the infant to a patrol vehicle where she was placed in the backseat at approximately 10:29 p.m.</p> <p>At approximately 11:00 p.m., Deputy Four went inside the residence and retrieved a second child who was sleeping inside of a crib. The second child was then given to the</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Plaintiff while in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. Deputy Four then gathered numerous essential items for the children's care from inside the residence.</p> <p>Paramedics arrived and administered medical treatment to the Decedent. The paramedics transported the Decedent by ambulance to the hospital for further medical treatment. The Decedent was pronounced deceased at 11:00 p.m. by an emergency room doctor.</p> <p>The Plaintiff asked deputy personnel if she could retrieve her vehicle and leave with her children. Deputy personnel advised the Plaintiff she was a witness in the initial call for service and would have to be transported to the station to be interviewed.</p> <p>At approximately 12:14 a.m., Deputy Six obtained a Witness Transportation Consent Form from the Plaintiff to transport her and her two children from the scene to the Sheriff Station for an interview by Homicide Detectives.</p> <p>Deputy Seven transported the Plaintiff and her two children in an unmarked Sheriff's Department vehicle with a soft back seat to the Sheriff Station pending an interview by Homicide Detectives.</p> <p>Upon being notified, Homicide Bureau investigators arrived at the residence and assumed control of the investigation.</p> <p>No deputies were injured during this incident.</p> <p>Deputy personnel involved in the incident were wearing and activated their body worn cameras.</p> |
|--|--|

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was:

- Deputies used deadly force.
- Desk personnel did not relay important information to field units regarding the Decedent's mental state nor assign the Mental Evaluation Team (MET) to the call.
- Desk personnel did not assign a sergeant to the call for service.
- Palmdale Station desk personnel did not place enough detailed information in the Hazardous Hit database for the residence.

A **non-associated Department** root cause in this incident was:

- A non-associate **Department** root cause in this incident was Palmdale Station personnel did not transport the Plaintiff and her children to the station in a timely manner and the investigatory detention was not brief.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was:

- The Decedent refused to comply with lawful orders by Deputy One, Deputy Two and Deputy Three.
- The Decedent's actions towards the deputies by swinging a sword.

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 thoroughly investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred. The results of the investigation were presented to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Justice System Integrity Division, for evaluation and filing consideration. The Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office concluded that Deputy Three used reasonable force under the circumstances.

Administrative Investigation:

This use-of-force was investigated by representatives from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau to determine if any Department policy violations occurred during the use or reporting of force used against the Plaintiff upon completion of the Criminal Investigation. The findings of the Internal Affairs Bureau were presented to the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for evaluation. The EFRC determined the force used was within Department policy, procedures and training.

All personnel involved in this incident received additional training pertaining to the circumstance surrounding this incident.

Station Debriefing (tactical):

In the days following the incident, station supervisors briefed the events known at the time and based on information provided by Homicide Bureau Investigators.

Station personnel were briefed on handling calls for service involving domestic violence incidents, mentally ill persons along with requesting additional resources for follow-up investigations and requesting a field supervisor as needed. Additional focus was placed on officer safety, tactical preparedness, and lessons learned to assist employees if they find themselves in a similar situation.

Continual briefings regarding body worn camera activation are ongoing.

All station desk personnel have been briefed on the importance of placing more descriptive details on HAZ hits for residences within the station's jurisdiction.

A global email to the Department regarding FOD 01-016, Witness Detention or Transportation was recently initiated.

Station Re-brief FOD 01-016- Witness Detention or Transportation:

Additional briefings have occurred for Field Operations Directive (FOD) 01-016, Witness Detention or Transportation.

Unit Order 25-01 Persons Mentally Ill/ Disengagement/ Force Reduction:

Palmdale Station has created a new Unit Order, 25-01 Persons Mentally Ill / Disengagement / Force Reduction. This order is currently being reviewed by the Department.

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:

10.17.25

Name: (Department Head)

Myron Johnson, Assistant
Sheriff Patrol Operations

Signature:



Date:

10/21/25

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:

Betty Karmirlian

Date:

10/22/25