



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  
Richard Lugo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. 2:20-CV-06620**



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 Richard Lugo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. 2:20-CV-06620**

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation:  
Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Richard Lugo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.,  
United States District Court Case No. 2:20-CV-06620 in the amount of \$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 civil rights violations of 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Substantive Due Process –  
interference with parent/child relationship arising from a fatal shooting involving Sheriff's  
deputies.

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Richard Lugo v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:20-CV-06620
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	July 24, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	BRIAN T. DUNN, ESQ. The Cochran Firm California
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	RICHARD HSUEH, ESQ. Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$500,000 inclusive of attorney's fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Richard Lugo, Sr., arising out of the fatal shooting of his son, Richard Lugo, Jr., on April 19, 2020. Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 267,115
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 46,317



## 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:	April 19, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2024-212</p> <p><b>Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.</b></p> <p>Based on the multiple investigative reports on April 19, 2020, at approximately 4:00 p.m., two private security guards were investigating vandalism at a museum.</p> <p>The security guards contacted the Decedent near an intersection; he threw a soda can through a window. The Decedent was pacing back and forth, concealing his hands inside of his jacket pocket. During questioning, the Decedent told the guards he had a gun and threatened to shoot.</p> <p>The Decedent scaled over a chain linked fence and fled. The security guards pursued the Decedent; however, they slowed after one of the guards lacerated his right thigh while climbing the fence. The security guards kept their distance but followed the Decedent.</p> <p>Detective One responded to a call near the station. LACo Fire #33, Fire Captain advised, personnel from Los Angeles County Fire were at another location on an unrelated call and were possibly detaining a person with a gun.</p> <p>The Fire Captain provided Detective One the address to where the individual was being detained. Detective One contacted Detective Two regarding a possible man with a gun. Detective Two relayed the information concerning a nearby "man with a gun" to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Station dispatch.</p> <p>Detective Two located the Decedent and relayed to Detective One the Decedent's location. Upon contacting the Decedent at a loading dock, the Decedent immediately took a kneeling position and placed his hands inside of his jacket and began to rock back-in-forth.</p>

Detectives One and Two both gave verbal commands to reveal his hands. The Decedent took his hands out of his pockets and immediately placed his hands inside his jacket pockets. Detective Two broadcast they were holding the Decedent at gunpoint.

The Decedent jumped off the loading dock, when he stumbled and fell. While doing so, Deputy One saw the Decedent brace his fall with one hand while keeping the other in his jacket pocket. Deputy One believed this behavior was indicative of him controlling a firearm in his pocket.

Deputy One observed when the Decedent stumbled and fell while keeping the other in his jacket pocket.

Additional Lancaster Deputies responded to the subsequent call for service, searching for a male White adult wearing a dark gray or blue jacket and tan pants who fled on foot.

The Decedent was uncooperative. He yelled, dropped something from his hand, and ran across the street. Deputy One gave the Decedent verbal commands to stop running. When the Decedent reached the parking lot of the business across the street, he turned to face both deputies. He knelt on one knee and placed his hand inside his jacket pocket, gesturing as if he would shoot them.

Deputy One requested assistance via his Department-issued radio at approximately 4:33 p.m. and indicated he was detaining a suspect (Decedent) armed with a firearm.

The Decedent, once again, knelt on one knee. He threatened to shoot them while gesturing that he had a firearm in his pocket. The deputies gave the Decedent verbal commands to comply and show his hands.

As the deputies got within approximately four to six feet from the Decedent, he made a sudden "jerking movement" with his right arm as if he was drawing a weapon. The deputy with the stun bag announced, "Stunbag! Stunbag!" and fired a less-lethal round towards the Decedent's abdomen.

When the Decedent made the jerking movement with his elbow, Deputy One feared for his life and the life of his partners in the immediate vicinity.

Deputy One fired several rounds from his service pistol.

Deputy Two was in a similar position to Deputy One, approximately four to six feet from the Decedent when he made the sudden movement with his right arm.

	<p>Deputy Two perceived he was about to be shot by the Decedent, and he fired several rounds from his service pistol.</p> <p>The deputies quickly transitioned to using medical rescue and rendered medical aid to the Decedent until the arrival of paramedics.</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Fire responded and provided medical aid to the Decedent.</p> <p>The Decedent sustained several gunshot wounds and was transported to the hospital. The Decedent was later pronounced deceased.</p> <p>The hospital's nursing staff found drug paraphernalia and small plastic baggie containing a white substance from inside the Decedent's right shoe.</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Scientific Services Bureau later tested the substance and determined it to be methamphetamine.</p> <p>A toxicology examination of the Decedent revealed, at the time of the autopsy, the presence of amphetamine and methamphetamine were confirmed to be in his system.</p>
--	---

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

<p>A <b>Department</b> root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two used deadly force.</p> <p>A <b>Department</b> root cause in this incident was the failure for Deputies One and Two to formulate a tactical plan to detain and/or render the suspect safe.</p> <p>A <b>Department</b> root cause in this incident was a lack of communication amongst Deputies One and two, to the responding deputies, which created an unsafe situation.</p> <p>A <b>Department</b> root cause in this incident was the deputy sheriffs were not equipped with Body-Worn Cameras. The recorded video would have captured the deputies' contact with the Plaintiff to prove or disprove the Plaintiff's allegations.</p> <p>A <b>non-Department</b> root cause in this incident was the Decedent's threatening display of behavior towards the two security guards. He acted as if he possessed a firearm and intended to hurt people. His actions generated a law enforcement response to the scene.</p> <p>A <b>non-Department</b> root cause in this incident was the Decedent persistently grabbed towards his front jacket pocket, simulated possessing a firearm, and stated he had a gun. The Decedent failed to comply with numerous verbal lawful orders to surrender peacefully.</p>
--

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

### **Criminal Investigation**

On November 8, 2021, JSID completed its review of the fatal shooting involving the Decedent. They concluded Deputy One and Deputy Two acted lawfully in self-defense and defense of others.

### **Administrative Investigation**

On September 23, 2023, this case was presented to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication.

The committee found the use of force, both lethal and less lethal, to be within Department policy; however, they found tactics were out of policy.

Deputies One and Two were found to have been in violation of the Department's Manual of Policies and Procedures as it pertains to the following sections:

- 3-01/030.10: Obedience to laws, regulations, and orders
- 3-10/150.00: Tactical Incidents
- 3-01/050.00: Performance to Standards

Deputy Three was recommended to attend a refresher course, while the Station was to conduct a tactical de-brief of the incident.

Deputies One and Two received additional training pertaining to the circumstances surrounding this incident.

### **Body-Worn Cameras (BWC)**

As of October 2020, all sworn personnel assigned to Lancaster Station were issued a Body-Worn Camera to ensure all public contacts are transparent. The use of BWCs ensures reliable recording of enforcement and investigative contacts with the public. The Department established the following policy and procedures for the purpose, use, and deployment of the Department-issued BWC.

### **Tactical Incident Debriefing**

The Captain conducted a tactical incident debriefing regarding the dynamic circumstances of this incident with all personnel involved. All the tactical aspects of this incident were addressed, including but not limited to the exigency of circumstances that dictated law enforcement action. A comprehensive review of the tactics and techniques implemented by deputy personnel were discussed.

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:

10.6.25

Name: (Department Head)

Ronald Kopperud, A/Chief  
North Patrol Division

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:

*Betty Karmirlian*

Date:

11/10/25