



County of Los Angeles

May 5, 2026

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: LILIANA CAMPOS
Litigation Cost Manager

RE: **Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda
County Claims Board Recommendation
Eli Matthews vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No.: 2:24-CV-01483**



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.

LC:tf

Attachments

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled Eli Matthews vs. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No.: 2:24-CV-01483, in the amount of \$600,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This federal lawsuit arises from the alleged excessive force by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Deputies.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Eli Matthews vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-CV-01483
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	February 22, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 600,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	MIKE ARIAS Arias Sanguinetti Wang & Team, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	DENISSE O. GASTELUM Gastellum Law, A Professional Corporation THOMAS C. HURRELL Hurrell and Cantrall LLP
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$600,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, an excessive force civil rights lawsuit filed by Eli Matthews (Plaintiff) after he was arrested by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) Deputies.</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 in the amount of \$600,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 150,551
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 30,350



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:	January 17, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2024-219</p> <p>Details provided 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 January 16, 2023, East Los Angeles Station Dispatch received a 9-1-1 call from the Plaintiff's sister who stated the Plaintiff and their mother were involved in an argument due to their mother would not give him her vehicle keys. The Plaintiff's sister also advised that the Plaintiff stole their mother's vehicle.</p> <p>Los Angeles County Deputies responded to the location and authored a criminal report regarding the stolen vehicle.</p> <p>On January 17, 2023, East Los Angeles Sheriff Station received a call from the Plaintiff's mother who stated her son who stolen her vehicle the night before had returned to the location.</p> <p>Deputies Three and Four contacted Plaintiff's mother who stated that the Plaintiff returned her vehicle and he was somewhere within the apartment complex. Upon locating the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff fled, ran through a parking garage and barricaded himself inside of the apartment complex office closet.</p> <p>Deputies gave verbal commands for the Plaintiff to exit the closet, but the Plaintiff refused to comply. While inside of the closet, the Plaintiff began to speak incoherently and threatened to use a broom he located inside of the closet to fight with the deputies. Sergeant One requested a Mental Evaluation Team (MET) to respond to the location for a psychological evaluation.</p>

	<p>MET arrived and attempted to build a report with the Plaintiff. MET spoke with the Plaintiff for approximately thirty minutes, to de-escalate the situation and convince the Plaintiff to exit the closet safely.</p> <p>After several failed attempts to gain compliance from the Plaintiff, Sergeant One ordered deputies to use force to remove the Plaintiff from the closet. Once the Plaintiff was removed from the closet, the deputies utilized two sets of handcuffs to handcuff the Plaintiff.</p> <p>The Plaintiff was searched and placed in a seated position. Deputy personnel requested LACoFD personnel to respond and provide medical treatment to the Plaintiff.</p> <p>The Plaintiff was transported via ambulance to the hospital for additional medical treatment.</p> <p>The incident was investigated by the East Los Angeles Detective Bureau. The results of the investigation were submitted to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office.</p> <p>On January 19, 2023, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office filed two counts of Penal Code Section 69, Obstructing/Resisting a Peace Officer; and one count of California Vehicle Code Section 10851(a), Taking a Vehicle without Owner's Consent.</p> <p>On August 8, 2023, the Plaintiff plead Nolo Contendere to Penal Code Section 69 PC.</p> <p>On August 8, 2024, he was sentenced to sixteen (16) days in jail and was placed on (12) months of summary probation.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the attempt by deputy personnel to detain the Plaintiff, who was the named suspect of a stolen vehicle investigation.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the inability of deputy personnel and the Mental Evaluation Team (MET) to gain the Plaintiff's cooperation.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was deputy personnel were involved in a use-of-force incident when they took the Plaintiff into custody.

A **Department** root cause in this incident were the numerous punches to the Plaintiff's face by Deputy Five, which were found to be in violation of policy.

A **non-associated Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Five not being placed in the Department's Performance Mentoring Program as recommended by the Executive Force Review Committee.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's failure to comply with lawful orders by deputy sheriff personnel.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's mental health condition.

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

Administrative Investigation

The incident was investigated by representatives of the Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Bureau to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after the incident. The results of the investigation were presented to the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

Employee Training

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


Station Tactical Debriefing

In the days following the incident, East Los Angeles Station supervisors briefed the incident to station personnel, regarding calls for service involving mentally ill persons, and use of force incidents. Additional focus was placed on officer safety, tactical preparedness, and situations involving the response of the Mental Evaluation Team. Briefings have continued on an on-going basis by station field sergeants and watch commanders to reiterate the Department's expectations and policies.

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 T. Hoang, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 2.8.26

Name: (Department Head)	
Yolanda R. Figueroa, Chief Central Patrol Division	
Signature: 	Date: 2/18/2026

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: 2/18/26