



County of Los Angeles

June 9, 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  
Angel Navarette v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-06433**



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 Angel Navarette v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-06433, in the amount of \$150,000, 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	Angel Navarette v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-CV-06433
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	September 8, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 150,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	JAMON R. HICKS Douglas/Hicks Law, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$150,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Angel Navarette (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 \$150,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 39,745
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 5,436



## 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:	September 25, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-246</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 multiple investigative reports, on September 25, 2020, the Sheriff's Response Team (SRT) was activated to assist with an organized crowd of protesters gathered in front of the Sheriff's Station.</p> <p>The protest concerned the decision not to prosecute the police officer who was involved in a shooting incident. The protesters' actions were perceived as hostile because they were dressed in protective gear and were using a caravan of two pick-up trucks to block traffic.</p> <p>Dispersal orders were given but the protesters continued to impede and block intersections. The Plaintiff was riding in the truck bed of one of the pickup trucks. When the SRT stopped the pick-up trucks in the caravan, some of the protestors began throwing objects at the deputies.</p> <p>At the same time, the Plaintiff jumped off the truck bed and grabbed the right arm of another protester to rescue him as he was being detained. The Plaintiff released his grasp of the protester, picked up a dark object from the ground, and advanced toward the skirmish line.</p> <p>In response, Deputy One used his shield to push the Plaintiff to the ground. Deputy Two used his shield and body weight to pin the Plaintiff to the ground to detain him. The Plaintiff rolled to his left and Deputy Two felt the Plaintiff pulling downward on his holstered firearm. In response, Deputy Two violently pulled away, causing the Plaintiff to release his grasp of the holster. The Plaintiff rolled over onto his stomach and placed his hands underneath his body. To</p>

	<p>counter the Plaintiff's continued resistance, Deputy Four placed his left hand and left knee on the Plaintiff's buttocks and hamstring area.</p> <p>At the same time, Deputy Three used his body weight to apply downward pressure to the left side of the Plaintiff's upper back and shoulder area. Deputy Two placed his right knee behind the Plaintiff's right elbow, pinning his arm underneath his body. Deputy Two used the bottom of his riot shield to strike the Plaintiff's ankles four to five times to gain compliance. The deputies were able to handcuff the Plaintiff and take him into custody.</p>
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the use of physical control tactics including a tactical shield to effect an arrest under stress. The struggle to subdue resistive arrests under dynamic crowd conditions.

A **Department** root cause of the incident was limited pre-event intelligence and threat assessment due to the Sheriff Intelligence Bureau's previous staffing reductions in June 2019.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the deputies were not all equipped with Body-Worn Cameras. Individual BWC on all personnel involved would have captured multiple angles of contact with the Plaintiff to prove or disprove his allegations.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the coordinated and escalated protest tactics. Protestors used vehicles to block roadways, wore body armor and gas masks, and carried makeshift shields. These actions suggest premeditation and preparation to resist lawful orders and disrupt public safety operations. The demonstration escalated beyond a peaceful assembly and presented a significant operational challenge for responding personnel.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's and protestors' refusal to adhere to the deputies' lawful orders to disperse from the area once deemed as an unlawful assembly.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff committing a criminal act. He interfered with the lawful arrest of an individual. The Plaintiff failed to comply with the lawful orders of deputy sheriffs, resisted them and attempted to disarm a deputy.

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

**Use of Force Investigation:**

Supervisors from the Sheriff's Response Team thoroughly investigated this incident. They determined there was no administrative misconduct before, during, or after the incident. The results of the investigation were presented to the Department executive for adjudication.

An executive evaluation of this incident found that none of the deputy sheriff's actions violated department policy. However, all deputies attended additional training relative to the circumstances involving this incident.

**Strengthening the Department's Intelligence Support and Coordination:**


The Department enhanced SIU by increasing staffing, updating technology, and improving coordination with field units. Intelligence support is now integrated into pre-event planning and will continue in a professional, policy-aligned manner.


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

As of May 9, 2024, all involved personnel were issued a Body-Worn Camera in an effort to ensure all public contacts are transparent.

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: 3.5.26

Name: (Department Head) Jason Skeen, Assistant Sheriff Countywide Operations	
Signature: 	Date: 3-16-26

**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: <i>Betty Karmirlian</i>	Date: 3/20/26