



County of Los Angeles

July 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
Chief 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
Estate of Edgar Ortiz, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et
al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWCV01015**



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 Estate of Edgar Ortiz, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWCV01015**

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation:
Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Estate of Edgar Ortiz, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWVC01015 in the amount of \$675,000 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 allegations of state civil rights violations, assault and battery, wrongful death, negligence, negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress, violations of Bane Act and Ralph Act, arising from a fatal deputy-involved shooting.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Estate of Edgar Ortiz, et al., v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	23NWCV01015
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	4/3/23
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 675,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	CHRITIAN CONTRERAS The Law Offices Of Christian Contreras
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	RICHARD HSUEH Senior Deputy County Counsel Justice and Safety Division JILL WILLIAMS Carpenter, Rothans, & Dumont, LLP
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$675,000 inclusive of attorney's fees and costs, a State wrongful death and civil rights lawsuit filed by the Estate of Edgar Ortiz, Christina Becerril, Maria Ortiz, and Edgar Ortiz's seven minor children arising out of the death of Edgar Ortiz in Bellflower during a fatal shooting when Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department deputies responded to an assault incident involving Edgar Ortiz. Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 144,701
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 116,850



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:	March 3, 2022, approximately 2349 hours
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-270</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 reports, on March 3, 2022, at approximately 2349 hours, a call for service was received regarding a "street takeover" at an intersection. The call indicated over a hundred spectators were at the street takeover. Numerous deputies responded to the location, which included Deputies One, Two, Three, Four and Five.</p> <p>Once the deputies arrived at the street takeover the crowd began to slowly disperse. As the crowd left the location, a traffic collision occurred in the area with two vehicles that were not involved in the street takeover. Deputy Three began assisting with the traffic collision. While assessing the traffic collision, he overheard yelling coming from a gas station directly behind him. He walked towards the gas station.</p> <p>A male adult (victim) approached deputies Three, Four and Five and informed them he had been stabbed by a male Hispanic (the decedent) with a garden tool at the gas station. The victim showed Deputy Three his stab wound.</p> <p>While the victim was relaying the information to the deputies, he saw and pointed the decedent out to Deputy Three. Deputy Three saw the decedent and the decedent's family walking from the gas station to their apartment complex which was located just south of the gas station. The decedent was seen walking and in possession of a metal garden tiller. Deputy Three used his handheld radio and informed other deputy personnel of the assault with a deadly weapon which had just occurred.</p>

	<p>Deputies Three and Four began walking toward the last seen location of the decedent while Deputy Five drove his patrol vehicle towards the apartment complex.</p> <p>Deputy Two and additional deputies saw the decedent and followed him towards the apartment complex. Deputies gave the decedent verbal commands to speak to them; however, the decedent did not acknowledge the deputies.</p> <p>Deputy One drove his patrol vehicle toward the apartment complex because he heard radio traffic on the direct radio frequency which requested an additional patrol vehicle at the apartment complex.</p> <p>Deputies located the decedent in the courtyard of the complex. Deputies Three, Four and later Five entered the courtyard. Deputy Three detained the decedent at gunpoint and ordered him to drop the metal garden tiller. The decedent ignored the deputies' commands and fled the location toward the front of the apartment complex, holding the metal gardening tool, and out of view. Deputies broadcasted emergency radio traffic and advised the decedent had fled from the scene to the front of the apartment complex. Deputy Two quickly moved to the front of the apartment complex.</p> <p>Deputy One, who was standing in front of the apartment complex, saw the decedent running in the street still holding the metal garden tiller. Deputy One drew his firearm from his holster and approached the decedent. The decedent quickly changed his path of travel and charged toward Deputy One with the metal garden tiller raised in his hand. The decedent had the garden tiller raised above his head in a throwing motion directed at Deputy One. The decedent was approximately 15 feet from Deputy One and quickly closed the distance. The metal spikes of the garden tiller were facing toward Deputy One.</p> <p>Deputy Two observed the decedent charging toward Deputy One, who was back peddling away from the decedent. Almost simultaneously, Deputy One and Deputy Two discharged their firearms striking the decedent numerous times. The decedent then fell to the ground.</p> <p>Deputy Four provided cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) to the decedent until the arrival of the paramedics.</p>
--	---

	<p>The decedent was transported to the hospital where he was pronounced deceased by the hospital physician.</p> <p>The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Homicide Bureau conducted the subsequent investigation and presented the facts to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. On February 12, 2024, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office reviewed the case and concluded that there was insufficient evidence to prove that Deputy One and Deputy Two did not reasonably believe that deadly force was necessary to defend against an imminent deadly threat when they fired their firearms.</p>
--	--

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

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One and Two used deadly force against the Decedent.

A **Department** root cause of this incident was the deputies' failure to use proper tactics in the approach of a high-risk individual.

A non-**Department** root cause of this incident was the decedent failed to obey commands by deputy personnel, wielding the garden tiller towards deputies who were within striking distance.

A **non-Department** root cause for this incident was the decedent committed assault upon a peace officer.

A **non-Department** root cause for this incident was the decedent stabbed a victim at the gas station with the garden tiller.

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

Criminal Investigation:

This incident was investigated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

This shooting was presented to the Justice System Integrity Division (JSID) of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office. The District Attorney Office concluded that there was insufficient evidence to prove that Deputy One and Deputy Two did not reasonably believe deadly force was necessary to defend against an imminent threat when they fired their firearms.

Administrative Investigation:

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Internal Affairs Bureau, conducted a thorough investigation into the circumstances of this use of force.

Upon completion of the administrative investigation, it was submitted for approval. Following approval, the case was presented to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication.

The findings and recommendations for the Executive Force Review Committee are as follows:

- The EFRC Panel determined that the force used by Deputy One and Deputy Two was within Department policy.
- The EFRC Panel determined that the tactics used by Deputies One, Two Three, Four and Five were not within Department policy.

Appropriate administrative action was taken, and additional training was recommended and completed.

Station Tactical Re-brief:

The EFRC Panel recommended the Station conduct a tactical debrief with all involved deputies regarding this incident and ensure that all Tasers are deployed as assigned on the daily roster. Additional re-briefs included the following:


- Body worn camera activation policy (MPP 3-06/200.08).
- Grooming standards (Tattoos) policy (MPP 3-01/050.80).
- The station conducted a tactical debrief with all involved deputies regarding this incident and reminded all personnel to deploy tasers as assigned on the daily roster.


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: 2.26.26

Name: (Department Head) Jorge Valdez, Chief South Patrol Division	
Signature: 	Date: 3/5/26

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
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: Roberto Chavez (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: Roberto Chavez 	Date: March 9, 2026 Digitally signed by Roberto Chavez Date: 2026.03.09 10:50:23 -07'00'