



County of Los Angeles

June 16, 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
Pascuala Ureno De Perez v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's
Department, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No.
23PSCV02146**



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 Pascuala Ureno De Perez v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23PSCV02146, in the amount of \$1,000,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Pascuala Ureno De Perez vs. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
CASE NUMBER	23PSCV02146
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	July 18, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	BYRON BALL, ESQ. The Ball Law Firm, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	KEVIN J. ENGELIEN Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This case arises from a traffic collision that occurred involving Plaintiff and Sheriff's Department Deputy Gregory Chico. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 73,776
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 87,175



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 07, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-261</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 7, 2023, at approximately 9:31 a.m., an on-duty Los Angeles County Sheriff Deputy assigned to a patrol station, was driving a marked black and white patrol vehicle when he collided with the Plaintiff.</p> <p>Deputy One was responding to a priority call for service regarding an active shooter at a high school. The call indicated multiple students and teachers had sustained gunshot wounds, and the suspect remained at the scene. Given the critical nature of the situation, multiple units responded Code-3. Deputy One was traveling north on an avenue, approaching the next street, with his emergency lights and siren activated (Code-3). Deputy One initially did not see any vehicle traffic traveling east or west on the opposing street and entered the intersection against a red light.</p> <p>As Deputy One proceeded through the intersection, his patrol vehicle was struck on the driver's side by the Plaintiff who was traveling east on said opposing street with a green light. The impact caused Deputy One's patrol vehicle to collide into the front end of a second vehicle who was traveling west on that opposing street. The force of both impacts caused Deputy One's patrol vehicle to veer and collide into the east curb of the avenue he was travelling on, before coming to a rest north of the intersection.</p> <p>Deputy One exited his patrol vehicle and immediately checked on the welfare of the Plaintiff. Deputy One requested the Fire Department to respond to provide medical aid to the Plaintiff.</p>

	<p>The Fire Department responded to the traffic collision. The Plaintiff was transported to a medical center for further medical treatment. Deputy One was also transported via ambulance to a different hospital for medical treatment.. Deputy One was wearing his seatbelt at the time of the collision.</p> <p>A Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department sergeant from the patrol station was notified of the traffic collision and responded to the location. The sergeant subsequently conducted an investigation and authored a Supervisor's Report of Incident or Damage to County Vehicle or Permittee's Vehicle report.</p> <p>As part of the investigation, the Plaintiff was interviewed at medical center. The Plaintiff stated she was traveling east on a street through the next avenue on a green light. The Plaintiff said her vehicle was struck by Deputy One's patrol vehicle causing her vehicle to spin and then come to a stop.</p> <p>The Plaintiff said she did not hear the patrol vehicle's siren due to all the windows in her vehicle being up. The Plaintiff was unable to determine the speed at which she was traveling at the time of the collision. The Plaintiff stated she was wearing her seatbelt at the time of the collision and the car radio was on low volume.</p> <p>Additionally, as part of the investigation, the sergeant reviewed Deputy One's body-worn camera (BWC). The BWC video footage confirms Deputy One's emergency lights and siren were activated while he was responding prior to the collision. The BWC video footage did not capture the vehicle collision as Deputy One's BWC only captured the interior of the vehicle.</p> <p>The El Monte Police Department responded to the scene and conducted a traffic collision investigation. The investigation concluded Deputy One was the primary cause of the traffic collision for failure to safely clear an intersection at a safe speed.</p>
--	--

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

A Department root cause of this incident is Deputy One's failure to stop at a red light.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One's failure to clear the intersection lane by lane.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One's excessive speed. Deputy One reduced the vehicle's speed to 63 MPH one (1) second before the collision. At the point of impact, Deputy One's speed was approximately 44.9 miles per hour on a street with a posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was Duarte High School advised there was an active shooter which involved multiple students and teachers being shot.

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

Traffic Collision Investigation:

This incident was investigated by a traffic police officer.

The collision investigation concluded Deputy One was the primary cause of the collision for failure to safely clear an intersection at a safe speed.

Administrative Investigation/Assignment of Administrative Driving Points:

This incident was investigated by representatives at the unit to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The results of the investigation were presented for Department executive adjudication.

Based on an evaluation of Deputy One's performance during this incident, it was determined that he was not working within the guidelines of what is expected from employees assigned to the patrol station and the Department and appropriate administrative action was taken. Deputy One also received additional training pertaining to the circumstances surrounding this incident.

Traffic Collision Assessment and Review:

The unit conducted a review and assessment of all traffic collisions for the calendar year 2020 through the end of 2024. The audit revealed the following:

- 107 preventable collisions occurred during the past five years.
- The most common casual factor was unsafe turning movements.

Based on the results of the audit, the patrol station has implemented traffic collision mitigation efforts, which included increased safety briefings, the use of peer leaders to talk about lessons learned in preventable traffic collisions, the use of visual aids, and having patrol trainees start driving sooner.

Sheriff's Department Announcement - Department Wide Driver's Safety Broadcast:

The safety message reminds personnel of their responsibilities when entering intersections and their duties to drive in a safe manner and clear intersections lane by lane.

Sheriff Department Announcement - Department Wide Re-brief:

The purpose of this re-brief is to remind Department personnel that the safety of Department members and the public is paramount when engaged in routine driving and Code 3 responses.

It is essential to maintain heightened officer safety, common sense, and sound tactics to reduce collision-related injuries, deaths, and financial liability to the Department.


Department-Wide Broadcast Announcements – Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC):


In an effort to mitigate Department traffic collisions, Risk Management Bureau has partnered with Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC) to create Department-Wide announcements.

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: 12/22/25

Name: (Department Head)	
Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature: 	Date: 12/24/25

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:

12/30/25