



County of Los Angeles

September 1, 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: EDWARD YEN
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
Brandon Bryan v. County of Los Angeles, et al. United
States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-00060 and
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV25557



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 and 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 Brandon Bryan v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-00060 and Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV25557

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation: Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Brandon Bryan v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-00060 and Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV25557 in the amount of \$250,000 and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department Contract Cities Trust Fund's budget.

These lawsuits concern allegations of civil rights violations, Monell liability, false arrest, battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress and negligence.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Brandon Bryan vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-CV-00060-FMO-AGR
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	October 19, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	ALVIN M. GOMEZ, ESQ. Gomez Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	JOSEPH A. LANGTON Principal Deputy County Counsel MARINA SAMSON Jones Mayer
NATURE OF CASE	This is a recommendation to settle for \$250,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Brandon Bryan after he was detained by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Deputies. Given the 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 \$250,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 164,519
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 19,134



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:	May 25, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-255 On Thursday, May 25, 2023, a Law Enforcement Technician (LET) received a call from a male reporting that his adult daughter had been sexually assaulted by a restaurant manager at a restaurant in San Dimas. The LET classified the call as a "261 Just Occurred" (rape) and created a call for service with instructions to contact the victim at her residence. The call was updated to indicate the reporting party (RP) was enroute to the restaurant to confront the suspect (manager). Deputies responded to the restaurant and contacted the RP, who stated the suspect, known only as "Randy," was inside. Deputies were directed to the on-duty manager (Plaintiff). The Plaintiff was on a phone call and refused to hang up or sit down. After repeated requests, Deputy One used profanity to compel compliance. Believing the Plaintiff may be the suspect and concerned for their safety, the Deputies detained the Plaintiff in handcuffs. He was escorted through the restaurant and detained in the back of a patrol vehicle. The RP later clarified that the Plaintiff was not the suspect. Despite this, the subject remained detained for approximately seven additional minutes while deputies attempted to confirm his identity. The actual suspect was subsequently identified and arrested.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two's failure to take sufficient time to confirm the suspect's identity.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two's failure to de-escalate the situation.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One's use of unprofessional language.

A **Department** in this incident was the dispatcher's failure to code the call properly.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two's failure to act on new exculpatory information.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Three's delay in removing the Plaintiff's handcuffs after being directed to do so by the supervisor.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Caller's independent actions by going to the restaurant to confront the suspect, which elevated the urgency of law enforcement response.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's refusal to answer deputies' questions. The Plaintiff's lack of cooperation contributed to the Deputies' difficulty in determining if he was the reported suspect, which extended the duration of the detention.

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

Administrative Investigation

The incident was reviewed by San Dimas Station supervisory personnel. The findings from this investigation were presented for Executive Review. Appropriate administrative action was taken and deputies received additional training based on the circumstances surrounding this incident.

Tactical Debriefing

Personnel received a post-incident briefing highlighting the importance of investigative strategy, professional conduct, and reassessing detentions when new or conflicting information arises. The debrief shared lessons learned to support improved future response.

Desk Training

The involved dispatcher received refresher training on proper dispatching and call classification procedures.

De-escalation Training

Field personnel received training in managing contacts with verbally uncooperative but non-resisting individuals. Emphasis was placed on maintaining control, professionalism, and avoiding unnecessary escalation in high-tension situations.

Supervisor Debriefing

The Watch Commander led a supervisory debrief with all field sergeants to reinforce expectations for proactive planning, identity verification, and reassessment of detentions during evolving investigations.

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 T. Hoang, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 5.26.26

Name: (Department Head)	
Elier Morejon, Chief East Patrol Division	
Signature: 	Date: 6.2.26

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: 	Date: 6/6/26