



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  
Sammy Newman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-03467  
Edward Malloy v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-04836**



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 Sammy Newman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-03467, and Edward Malloy v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:22-CV-04836 in the amount of \$1,500,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

These federal civil rights lawsuits allege Plaintiffs were unconstitutionally group searched by Sheriff's Department jail staff at the Men's Central Jail.

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Sammy Newman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. and Edward Malloy v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-CV-03467 and 2:22-CV-04836
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	May 23, 2022 and July 14, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	BARRETT S. LITT McLane, Bednarski & Litt, LLP  JOVAN BACKNELL Law Office of J. Blacknell
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel  JUSTIN CLARK Lawrence Beach Allen & Choi, PC
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$1,500,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a proposed class action lawsuit brought by Sammy Newman and a related non-class action lawsuit brought by Edward Malloy (collectively Plaintiffs) against the County alleging federal and State civil rights violations.  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 cases in the amount of \$1,500,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 276,427
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 40,804



## 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 7, 2021
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan</p> <p>On September 7, 2021, the Department received a credible threat that narcotics and a firearm had been smuggled into the jail by someone now housed at Men's Central Jail (MCJ). After an initial investigation led some credibility to the threat, all of the jail facilities were placed on a full lockdown and a systematic search of the affected housing units was implemented.</p> <p>The systematic search involved calling in the Special Enforcement Bureau (SEB) to oversee the removal of individuals housed in affected areas one by one. During the search process, individuals were removed from their cells in their boxer shorts, then told to remove their boxer shorts while they were escorted to a body scanner. After cleared on the body scanner, the individuals were moved and given boxers.</p> <p>While the body scanners were being used, canine units searched the unoccupied cells. The cell of one (1) of the individuals suspected of receiving the narcotics and/or firearm was alerted on by a canine. A more thorough search of the cell revealed hidden narcotics, but no firearm.</p> <p>The individual housed in the cell with narcotics agreed to voluntarily submit to a body scan, which revealed an foreign object was secreted inside him. He agreed to an x-ray, which confirmed the presence of narcotics inside him, but ruled out a firearm.</p> <p>As the search was going on, investigators continued to investigate the original threat. As the investigation progressed, the person who made the original allegation recanted the portion of the allegation involving a firearm, admitting that it was only narcotics that were smuggled in.</p>

	The entire search process lasted from September 7, 2021, at approximately 1:05 pm, to September 8, 2021, at approximately 2:55 am.
--	--

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


<p>The following departmental root causes were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bifurcation of the command post</li><li>• Failure to activate the custody Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to oversee the operation</li><li>• Prolonged removal of the boxers of individuals being searched</li><li>• Lack of high-quality body scan images</li></ul>
---


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

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Emergency Operations Center Activation – Rebriefing and education on the availability and appropriateness of activating the EOC during a large-scale operation or incident</li><li>2) EOC Roster – An updated roster was created and maintained by Custody Support Services Bureau (CSSB), ensuring command staff know who can be contacted across the Department, regardless of the time of day, when large scale, multiunit responses are required</li><li>3) Immediate Clothing of Individuals – In similar incidents in the future, SEB and custody staff will create an individualized plan, based on the unique circumstances of the incident, to ensure individuals do not have to be escorted and moved significant distances while unclothed</li><li>4) EOC Training – A new training course was developed and made available to all custody units to ensure they understand how to activate the EOC, the role the EOC plays, and how to properly communicate during these type of large scale incidents.</li><li>5) Body Scanner Improvements – One (1) body scanner at MCJ was set on a higher resolution</li><li>6) New Body Scanners – New, significantly improved body scanners have been installed and placed into service at all of the facilities, including MCJ.</li></ol>
---


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.

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) Christine M. Coles, Commander Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: 	Date: 3-31-26

Name: (Department Head) Tania E. Plunkett, Chief Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: 	Date: 4/1/26

<b>Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY</b>	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this Department.	

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Betty Karmirlian	
Signature: 	Date: 4/2/26