OFFICE OF THE
COUNTY
COUNSEL

County of Los Angeles

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

October 9, 2026

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
Alexis Cernas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-03261

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 be placed on the Board of Supervisors' agenda.

TJK:sr

Attachment

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

TEL 213.972.5742
TDD 213.633.0901

Board Agenda

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Settlement for Matter Entitled Alexis Cernas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-03261

Los Angeles County Contract Cities Liability Trust Fund Claims Board's recommendation: Authorized Settlement of the matter entitled Alexis Cernas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al., United States District Court Case No. 2:24-CV-03261 in the amount of $6,500,000 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 federal and state civil rights violations, excessive force, conspiracy, Monell liability, violation of Bane Act, negligence and battery arising from a fatal deputies involve shooting.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Alexis Cernas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:24-CV-03261
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		April 19, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	6,500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		DALE K. GALIPO, ESQ., Law Offices of Dale Galipo LUIS CARRILLO Carillo Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		RICHARD HSUEH Senior Deputy County Counsel Justice and Safety Division EUGENE RAMIREZ Manning & Kass, LLP
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $6,500,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this wrongful death and civil rights lawsuit filed by the mother, and the three children of Arturo Cernas (Decedent)(collectively, Plaintiffs) against the County of Los Angeles (County) and three Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) deputies. The lawsuit arises from the fatal shooting of Decedent when LASD Deputies responded to disturbance call at a gas station involving Decedent. 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 $6,500,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	165,576
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	104,538

Case Name: Alexis Cernas et al. 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:	August 07, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-291 **Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.** On August 7, 2023, at approximately 1:53 a.m., a patrol station received a 9-1-1 call about an adult male Hispanic "acting suspiciously – possible transient" at a gas station. Patrol Deputies One, Two and Three, each driving a separate black and white patrol vehicle, arrived at the gas station at approximately 2:19 a.m. The deputies located the Decedent at the property, standing on the concrete walkway in front of the convenience store. While approaching the Decedent, Deputies One and Two saw a handgun sticking out of the Decedent's front left pants pocket. They radioed dispatch to update the status of the suspect. Deputies One and Two drew their firearms and backed away from the Decedent to their patrol vehicles to take cover. The deputies gave the Decedent repeated commands not to reach for "it" and ordered him to kneel on the ground. At approximately 2:20 a.m., Deputy Two retrieved a 40 mm launcher from the trunk of his patrol vehicle. At that point, Deputy Two took cover behind his patrol vehicle driver's side door, and Deputy One moved behind the passenger side door of the same patrol vehicle. Deputy Three moved behind the driver side door of Deputy One's patrol vehicle. Despite being ordered to put his hands up, the Decedent was only partially compliant and continuously moved his arms and hands. The deputies again ordered the Decedent to kneel on the ground, which he did with his back facing the Deputies. After ordering nearby civilians to move away, the deputies requested assistance from additional patrol units. The

	decedent remained on his knees for approximately two minutes while he was detained at gunpoint. The deputies repeatedly told the Decedent to put his hands on his head and not to lower his hands or reach for anything. Deputy Two told Deputy One that he intended to fire his 40 mm launcher if the Decedent reached for his left pocket (where the gun was located). About ten seconds later, the Decedent reached for the gun. Deputy Two fired a 40 mm round and almost simultaneously, Deputy One fired his firearm five times, striking the Decedent four times. As he was being shot, the Decedent tossed the gun to the ground. Deputy Three did not fire his weapon; from his vantage point he did not see the Decedent reach for the firearm. The deputies immediately requested assistance from the Fire Department and rendered aid until their arrival. The Fire Department pronounced the Decedent dead approximately seven minutes later.

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

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy Two's failure to announce less lethal prior to employment to notify his assisting units on scene.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the desk personnel's failure to request MET after the caller reported the individual yelling.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was that deputies were not equipped with a Taser. Having a Taser could have allowed them to temporarily incapacitate the subject and gain control before he accessed his firearm.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the decedent's failure to comply with the lawful commands of Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Decedent's toxicology report showed methamphetamine and its active metabolite amphetamine in his blood at the time of the incident.

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 Department (Department) Homicide Bureau and was submitted to the Justice System Integrity Division (JSID) of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for consideration of filing criminal charges. At the time of the report, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office had not advised the Department of their findings.

Administrative Investigation

Upon completion of the investigation by the D.A.'s Office, the Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) will investigate this incident to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after the incident. Upon completion of the administrative investigation, appropriate administrative action will be taken.

Personnel involved in this incident received additional briefings and training.

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: Tri Hoang	Date: 8.28.26

Name: (Department Head) Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature:	Date: 9/1/26

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: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 9/4/26