OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY
COUNSEL

County of Los Angeles

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

November 10, 2026

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
Sebastian Palma v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-06829

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

648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012-2713

TEL 213.808.8729
TDD 213.633.0901
LCampos@counsel.lacounty.gov

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Los Angeles County Claims Board's recommendation: Authorize settlement of the matter entitled Sebastian Palma v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-06829, in the amount of $250,000, and instruct the Auditor-Controller to draw a warrant to implement this settlement from the Sheriff's Department's budget.

This federal lawsuit arises from alleged Plaintiff's civil rights violations by the Sheriff's Department.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Sebastian Palma v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:23-CV-06829
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		August 18, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		PETER L. CARR PLC LAW GROUP, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel SARA GRECO Seki, Nishimura & Watase, LLP
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $250,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this federal and State civil rights lawsuit filed by Sebastian Palma (Plaintiff) against the County and Deputies Aaron Suarez-Villamil, Antonio Navarro, Logan Foley and Albert White, alleging unreasonable search and seizure, false arrest, Monell violations, denial of medical care, negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and violation of the Bane Act arising out of Plaintiff's arrest. 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 case in the amount of $250,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	120,587
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	8,528

Case Name: Sebastian Palma v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

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 09, 2022
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Sebastian Palma v. County of Los Angeles, et al.** Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-299 On May 9, 2022, personnel from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Crime Impact Team conducted a planned follow-up operation to locate and arrest The Plaintiff, a named suspect in an ongoing felony investigation assigned to Detective Deputy One. The investigation stemmed from allegations resulting in a judicial probable cause determination prior to the arrest. Using Sheriff's Department databases, deputies confirmed the Plaintiff's residence and developed an operations plan to conduct surveillance and verify his presence. The team arrived at the location and visually confirmed the Plaintiff was inside the residence. Deputy Three approached the front door and knocked. Ring camera footage later produced during civil discovery shows that Plaintiff did not answer the door; instead, his girlfriend opened it. As the door opened, Deputy Two proceeded several steps inside the residence and placed the Plaintiff into custody, handcuffing him in the living area. No arrest warrant was obtained prior to the arrest. Following the arrest, the Plaintiff was transported to the station jail, where he was booked and later interviewed by Detective One. The Plaintiff was subsequently transferred through custody facilities. The District Attorney declined to file criminal charges on May 11, 2022, citing insufficient corroborating evidence. The Plaintiff was released from custody on May 13, 2022. Internal review determined deputies acted with probable cause in arresting a named felony suspect and concluded the arrest was lawful; however, the review was based on deputies' statements indicating the arrest occurred at the

	threshold of the doorway. The Ring camera footage obtained later contradicted portions of those accounts by showing entry into the residence prior to handcuffing. Deputies Two and Four failed to activate their body-worn cameras.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the absence of a Ramey arrest warrant for the Plaintiff.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Two entered the residence without consent or a warrant.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Deputies reported they arrested the Plaintiff at the threshold of the doorway.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Two and Deputy Four failed to activate their body worn cameras.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff was over detained for two days after the District Attorney declined to file criminal charges.

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

Supervisory inquiry
A supervisory inquiry into the actions surrounding this incident is being conducted. Upon completion of the inquiry, appropriate administrative action will be taken.

Search Warrant and Warrantless Arrest Training:

The patrol training sergeant conducted a re-brief and training involving search warrants and warrantless arrests.

Body Worn Camera Training- Involved Personnel:

Personnel were re-briefed on body worn camera policies. Deputies at the station are re-briefed on a monthly basis.

Custody Over Detentions

As a fail-safe to prevent over detentions, a report is automatically generated of inmates in LASD's custody who have not been to court within 48 hours, and an experienced clerk is assigned to determine the status of these inmates and whether they are entitled to release.

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: 8.9.26

Name: (Department Head) Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature:	Date: 8/11/2026

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: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 8/14/26