



County of Los Angeles

August 11, 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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'LC' or similar initials.

RE: **Item for the Board of Supervisors' Agenda**
County Claims Board Recommendation
Beckham Cardona v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-06225



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 Beckham Cardona v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-06225, in the amount of \$395,775, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Probation Department's budget.

This lawsuit arises from alleged emotional and physical injuries sustained when Plaintiff was a detainee at Kilpatrick Juvenile Detention Camp.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Beckham Cardona v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:23-CV-06225-PD
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	August 1, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Probation Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 395,775
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	LUIS A. CARRILLO MICHAEL S. CARRILLO Carrillo Law Firm, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	ANNA R. REITANO Deputy County Counsel CHANDLER PARKER, ESQ. Collins & Collins, LLP
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$395,775, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this civil rights lawsuit filed by Beckham Cardona, a former detainee at Kilpatrick Juvenile Detention Camp against the County, the Probation Department, Deputy Probation Officers Oscar Cross, Ruben Ramirez, Adriana Guzman, Tanesha Lockhart, Michael Mata, Lonnie Abernathy, and Deborah Sims. Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 65,471
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 3,757



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:	October 23, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On October 23, 2020, Plaintiff was involved in a Use of Force incident involving seven Los Angeles County Probation Staff. The incident took place at Campus Kilpatrick. Plaintiff was being combative towards Probation staff and throwing and kicking food. Staff intervened and counseled Plaintiff, but his agitation continued. After throwing food at DPO One, the Plaintiff made physical contact with the staff causing him to fall and engage in a use of force incident. The Plaintiff was moved away from DPO One but continued to be assaultive and attempted to throw a chair until SDPO Two and DPO Three were able to remove it from his hands. The Plaintiff continued to be upset, verbally stating he was angry towards DPO One and threatening to harm him. Redirection and de-escalation techniques were used with the Plaintiff, but when he attempted to throw a chair at DPO One again, the Response Team was called for assistance as the chair was removed from his hands. When the response team arrived, SDPO One, DPO Two, DPO Five and DPO Four, the Plaintiff became more combative. Plaintiff stood up from the bed he was sitting on and attempted to advance towards SDPO One. SDPO One extended his arm to stop the Plaintiff, but the Plaintiff instead grabbed his wrist. DPO Four, DPO Three, DPO Two and SDPO Two attempted to disengage the Plaintiff from SDPO One's wrist and counsel him to calm down. DPO Four initiated force at that time and pushed the Plaintiff to the bed. DPO Two and DPO Four instructed the Plaintiff to move to prone position, but he resisted and attempted to break free. DPO Three and SDPO Two attempted to gain control of the Plaintiff's legs. Plaintiff continued resisting and SDPO One began bending his left leg, applying pressure and telling him to stop resisting. The struggle to gain control of the Plaintiff ensued for some time before he was secured, and handcuffed.

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

- A. Employee Misconduct
- B. Failure of the Department to refer the case to the District Attorney and ratification of employee conduct
- C. Excessive Use of Force

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

- A. An Internal Affairs investigation was completed, and appropriate administrative actions were taken against employees who were found to have violated department policies.
- B. Criminal charges were filed against one employee in 2023.
- C. The Physical Interventions policy was updated in June 2022 to include updated language regarding the definition of excessive force. Since 2022, all staff have been trained in the new policy and have ongoing Physical Intervention Training (Use of Force) annually.

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)	
Crystal Hurtado	
Signature: <i>Crystal Hurtado</i>	Date: 5/18/2026

Name: (Department Head)	
Stacy Lopez-Maddox	
Signature: <i>Stacy Lopez-Maddox</i>	Date: 5/18/2026

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: (Risk Management Inspector General)
Betty Karmirlian

Signature:
Betty Karmirlian

Date:
5/19/26