COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CLAIMS BOARD

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Oscar Valdez
Office of the Auditor-Controller

Destiny Castro
Chief Executive Office

Liliana Campos
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

The Los Angeles County Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, June 15, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.**, at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Sixth Floor, Conference Room C, Los Angeles, California 90012. **Members of the public who would like to listen to the open session of the meeting or would like to provide public comment may call (323) 776-6996, then enter ID 183 661 330# at 9:30 a.m. on June 15, 2026.**

Reports of actions taken in Closed Session. The Los Angeles County Claims Board will report actions taken on any Closed Session Items on Monday, June 15, 2026, at approximately 1:20 p.m. Members of the public who would like to hear the reportable actions taken on any Closed Session items may call (323) 776-6996, then enter ID 183 661 330# at 1:20 p.m. on June 15, 2026. Please note that this is an approximate start time and there may be a short delay before the Closed Session is concluded and the actions can be reported.

TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT:

You may submit written public comments by e-mail to claimsboard@counsel.lacounty.gov or by mail to: Attention: Los Angeles County Claims Board, Executive Office, County Counsel, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012.

Written public comments or documentation must be submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. on Friday, June 12, 2026. Please include the agenda item and meeting date in your correspondence. Comments and any other written submissions will become part of the official record of the meeting.

If you wish to address the Los Angeles County Claims Board in person, you may come to the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, and enter on the Second Floor. Please advise the security guard station personnel that you would like to attend the public portion of the Claims Board meeting, and you will be escorted to the Sixth Floor and be assisted.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Public comment is limited to the specific items on the agenda and general public comment is limited to subject matters within the jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: The Agenda and any supporting documents will be posted at https://lacounty.gov/newsroom/public-information/los-angeles-county-claims-board/ and can be provided upon request. Please submit requests for supporting documents to claimsboard@counsel.lacounty.gov.

If you would like more information, please contact Claims Board Administrator Thomas Finley at tfinley@counsel.lacounty.gov or Management Specialist Raina Mey at rmey@counsel.lacounty.gov.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.

2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session Item(s) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Paragraph (1) of Subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9).

   a. Tae W. Yoo v. Andrea Yvonne White, et al.
   Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 25STCV09943

   This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Mental Health employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of $35,000.

   See Supporting Document

   b. Maria De Lourdes Galvan v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
   Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23VECV02914

   This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Children and Family Services employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of $22,500.

   See Supporting Document

   c. Zyra Waters v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
   Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23AVCV01422

   This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Children and Family Services employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of $65,000.

   See Supporting Document

   d. Diamond McDowell, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
   Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV12704

   This lawsuit arises from alleged emotional and physical injuries sustained by Plaintiffs when the Sheriff's Department responded to an agency assist call from social workers; settlement is recommended in the amount of $99,000.

   See Supporting Document

   e. Marina Barajas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
   San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2420710

   This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiffs sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of $305,964.

   See Supporting Documents

f. Jayvonte George v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV29933

This lawsuit arises from alleged emotional and physical injuries sustained when Plaintiff was detained and arrested by the Sheriff's Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of $250,000.

See Supporting Documents

g. Christopher Prevedello v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-08435

This lawsuit arises from injuries sustained by Plaintiff due to alleged negligence of the Sheriff's Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of $490,000.

See Supporting Documents

h. Donel Crespin v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV25582

This lawsuit arises from injuries sustained by Plaintiff due to alleged negligence of the Sheriff's Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of $800,000.

See Supporting Documents

i. Beckham Cardona v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-CV-06225

This lawsuit arises from alleged emotional and physical injuries sustained when Plaintiff was a detainee at Kilpatrick Juvenile Detention Camp; settlement is recommended in the amount of $395,775.

See Supporting Documents

j. Rosalyn Campfield v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV11418

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Mental Health was subjected to harassment; settlement is recommended in the amount of $40,000.

k. Jan Williams v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV39355

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of $100,000.

l. James Padilla v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV13214

This lawsuit alleges that the Sheriff's Department failed to accommodate Plaintiff's disability; settlement is recommended in the amount of $99,000.

m. Amy Pentz v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV28237

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of $1,750,000.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the May 18, 2026, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

See Supporting Document

5. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Tae W. Yoo v. Andrea Yvonne White, et. al
CASE NUMBER		25STCV09943
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		April 3, 2025
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Mental Health
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		PAUL KIM, ESQ. Law Offices of John C. Ye, APLC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		LATASHA N. CORRY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises from an automobile accident that occurred on April 13, 2023. Plaintiff alleges he was injuried and filed a lawsuit. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	23,148
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	204

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Maria De Lourdes Galvan vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23VECV02914
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		July 5, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	22,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		MITCHELL BERMAN, ESQ. L.A. Injury Attorneys
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		LATASHA N. CORRY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises from an automobile accident that occurred on July 6, 2022. Plaintiff alleges she was injured and filed a lawsuit. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	54,894
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	20,855

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Zyra Waters v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23AVCV01422
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		December 8, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	65,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Z. Dean Hakkak First Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Nena Vuong Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		On May 19, 2023, a collision between a vehicle driven by County employee Sabastian Camacho and Plaintiff's automobile occurred at the intersection of Avenue M and 5th Street West in Palmdale, California. Plaintiff alleges the collision caused injuries and property damage for which she seek compensation. Given the risk and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $65,000 is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	32,276
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	1,228

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Diamond McDowell, et al., v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		24STCV12704
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		May 20, 2026
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	99,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		CHRISTIAN CONTRERAS, ESQ. The Law Offices of Christian Contreras
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		RICHARD HSUEH Senior Deputy County Counsel Justice and Safety Division TOM GUTERRES, ESQ. Collins & Collins, LLP
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $99,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this State law lawsuit filed by Diamond McDowell and her children S. D. and B. R. Jr., when the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department deputies responded to an agency assist call from social workers of the Los Angels County Department of Children and Family Services involving Diamond and S.D. Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	124,549
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	21,075

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Marina Barajas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		CIVSB2420710
COURT		San Bernardino Superior Court
DATE FILED		July 2, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	305,964
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		WARREN M. ELLIS, ESQ. Ellis & Ellis
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MELISSA A. MCCAVERTY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from a traffic collision that occurred on December 19, 2023. Plaintiffs claim they suffered injuries and damages as a result of the collision. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	74,403
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	36,793

Case Name: Mariana Barajas 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:	
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-292 **Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident**. On December 19, 2023, at approximately 7:30 a.m., the Plaintiff was driving her vehicle westbound on a roadway approaching an intersection in the City of Fontana, County of San Bernardino. The Plaintiff had three passengers (children) seated in the backseat. While traveling at an admitted speed of 60 mph, the Plaintiff's vehicle collided with a vehicle driven by a Chief as he entered the intersection. At the time of the incident, the Chief was commuting to work from his home and was 'on duty' at the time of the incident. The Chief maintains that he made a full stop at the stop sign at the intersection and looked both ways for cross-traffic before proceeding through the intersection to make a left (eastbound) turn onto the roadway. Immediately after entering the intersection, he noticed the Plaintiff's vehicle approaching at a high rate of speed and realized he was unable to avoid the collision. Following the collision, the Chief approached the driver's side of the Plaintiff's vehicle to determine whether she required assistance and noticed three children in the backseat. The Chief assisted in getting the children out of the vehicle. All occupants in the Plaintiff's vehicle reported injuries and were treated at the scene by paramedics. The Plaintiff was subsequently transported via ambulance to a local hospital for further treatment of her injuries. The Chief was also injured as a result of the collision and received subsequent medical treatment.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Chief's failure to yield to the Plaintiff's vehicle before entering onto the highway.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was attributed to the Plaintiff traveling at an unsafe speed (60 MPH in a 45 MPH zone).

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

Traffic Collision Investigation

This incident was thoroughly investigated by investigators from Fontana Police Department Officer. The collision investigation concluded the Chief caused the collision when he failed to yield to the Plaintiff's oncoming vehicle upon entry onto the highway, in violation of California Vehicle Code Section 21801(a).

Administrative Investigation

Executive evaluation of this incident concurred with the findings of the traffic collision investigation. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

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: Tri Hoang	Date: 5.27.26

Name: (Department Head) Yolanda Figueroa, Chief Central Patrol Division	
Signature: Yolanda R. Fig	Date: 6/1/2026

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: 6/2/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Jayvonte George v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23STCV29933
COURT		Los Angeles County Superior Court
DATE FILED		December 7, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		TONI JARAMILLA Toni Jaramilla, APLC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $250,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a State civil rights lawsuit filed by Jayvonte George (Plaintiff),for negligence, assault, battery, and violations of the Bane and Ralph Civil Rights Acts. 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	$	108,191
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	7,374

Case Name: Jayvonte George 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:	April 10, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-258 **Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.** Based on multiple investigative reports, Deputies One and Two were traveling northbound on an avenue in a patrol vehicle when they observed three men (including the Plaintiff) walking. The deputies believed the men closely resembled suspects involved in a nearby hit-and-run traffic collision and stolen vehicle pursuit which occurred earlier on the same day and a nearby vehicle theft which occurred two days prior. The Deputies turned westbound and saw the men stop walking, turn, and face their patrol vehicle. The deputies noted the men appeared abnormally nervous. The Plaintiff turned around, placed his hands in his jacket pockets, and began to rapidly walk away from the patrol vehicle. All three men were dressed in dark colored, baggy hooded sweatshirts, which are often used by suspects to conceal weapons. Deputy One got out of his patrol vehicle and instructed the men to stop walking and attempted to detain them pending a vehicle theft suspect identification process. As Deputy One approached the Plaintiff, he saw him place both of his hands in his jacket pockets again and noticed his eyes were darting back and forth. In order to conduct a cursory search for weapons, Deputy One attempted to detain the Plaintiff by firmly gripping his left arm and wrist. The Plaintiff immediately tensed his arm, began to step away and asked why he was being detained. The Plaintiff's friends also questioned the detention while one of them recorded the Deputies on his cell phone. Deputy One adjusted his grip on the Plaintiff's left arm and

	continued giving orders for him to put his hands behind his back. Deputy One subsequently grabbed the Plaintiff's right arm as Deputy Two took control of his left arm. After some resistance by the Plaintiff, the deputies were finally able to place the Plaintiff's hands behind his back and apply handcuffs. Additional deputies and a field sergeant arrived and provided scene security. Deputy One attempted to explain the reason for the detention, but the Plaintiff repeatedly yelled profanities and raised his voice over Deputy One's voice. Deputy One placed the Plaintiff in the back of the patrol vehicle for safety reasons due to a growing crowd. The field sergeant briefly spoke to the Plaintiff while he remained in the back seat of the patrol vehicle. He told the Plaintiff he was being detained because he matched the description of a stolen vehicle suspect. The Plaintiff was transported to the patrol station where he was booked for Obstructing a Law Enforcement Officer in violation of Penal Code section 148(a). Deputies interviewed the Plaintiff at the station about the auto theft and hit-and-run incidents occurred. It was then determined, based on the totality of the circumstances, there was insufficient evidence to show the Plaintiff was involved in the vehicle theft incident. The Los Angeles County District Attorney (DA) rejected the case, and no charges were formally filed against the Plaintiff.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the deputies used control techniques on the Plaintiff during a use of force. A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputies One and Two did not immediately activate their Body Worn Cameras (BWC) upon their arrival and prior to contacting the Plaintiff. A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff's failure to obey lawful orders given by deputies during a lawful detention and/or vehicle theft investigation.

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

Unit Level Administrative Investigation:

This incident was thoroughly investigated by the Department to determine or identify any potential policy or procedural violations. It was determined the force used by Deputy One and Two was objectively reasonable and within policy. Although the force was within Department policy, it was determined both Deputies One and Two did not immediately activate their BWC upon their arrival and violated the BWC activation policy. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

Station Personnel De-briefing:

This incident and the circumstances surrounding it was de-briefed thoroughly by the training staff at the station. Topics including Alternative force options, Tactics, BWC activation and adequate scene containment and control of bystanders were discussed.

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: Tri Hoang	Date: 5.27.24

Name: (Department Head) Yolanda Figueroa, Chief Central Patrol Division	
Signature: Yolanda R Fig	Date: 6/3/2024

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: 6/3/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Christopher Prevedello vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:23-CV-08435
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		October 6, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	490,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		J. ALEJANDRO BARRIENTOS Barrientos PC QUINN MAYBERRY Mayberry Law
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel LAURA INLOW Collinson & Greco, LLP
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $490,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a lawsuit filed by Christopher Prevedello (Plaintiff), alleging federal and State civil rights violations. 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 $490,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	119,509
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	41,101

Case Name: Christopher Prevedello 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:	
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-275 **Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.** Based on multiple investigative reports, on March 23, 2023, the Plaintiff was brought to a courthouse by LASD Court Services Transportation personnel and subsequently placed in the wrong cell based on his classification. The Plaintiff had a scheduled court appearance. Deputy One was assigned to the courthouse as a bailiff; however, worked overtime in the main lock-up. On March 23, 2023, he was working a one-hour overtime shift in lock up. Unbeknownst to Deputy One, two inmates with a different classification than the Plaintiff were placed in the cell. The lock up deputies use a magnet system to further ensure the safe housing of inmates. The same deputy was also scanning the inmates into lock up off the bus that morning and failed to mark Cell #8 with a magnet. The Plaintiff was scanned into the courthouse and off the bus. Deputy One was directing inmate placement that day and believed he heard a Department member call out a particular classification for Cell #8 when he scanned in the Plaintiff. Deputy One failed to check the wristbands of the two inmates who were already in the cell and directed the Plaintiff into the cell. Deputy One walked back over to the main processing desk in lock-up to continue working his overtime position. CCTV footage shows the Plaintiff initially entered the cell and was standing by the cell door. The other two inmates were sitting on the bench. The Plaintiff walked over to the bench and asked the inmates to make room for him. He starts reading a book on the bench when the other two inmates take note of the

	classification of his wristband. The other inmates attacked him. The Plaintiff was punched multiple times all over his body including his face. The beating continued for about one minute and twelve seconds before deputies arrived and broke it up. The Plaintiff was transported to a local hospital to be medically treated. The Department's internal investigation concluded that the actions of Deputy One violated Court Services Division Manual Sections 2-071015.10, Special Handling; and/or 3-0l/050.10, Performance to Standards. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

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

The **root causes** of this incident were:

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One placed the Plaintiff in a cell with other inmates that were of a different classification.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the cell was not properly classified with a classification magnet.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One was given wrong information by an unidentified individual when he attempted to confirm the correct cell to place the Plaintiff.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One did not check the wristband of the Plaintiff before placing him in the cell.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was Deputy One was performing duties of multiple job assignments due to short staffing and did not sufficiently verify temporary housing accurately.

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

Station Debriefing

Court Services Bureau supervisors have since continued quarterly briefings to reiterate Department policies and expectations.

Staffing Shortages

Courthouse scheduling deputies have since been sending out countywide emails, requesting Department personnel, including sergeants, deputies, and custody assistants to work overtime in assisting with staffing shortages.

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: 4.6.26

Name: (Department Head) Shawn R. Kehoe, Acting Chief Court Services Division	
Signature:	Date: 5/12/26

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: 5/13/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Donel Crespin v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		24STCV25582
COURT		Los Angeles County Superior Court
DATE FILED		October 1, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	800,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		ERIK ZOGRABIAN D & Z Law Group, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MINAS SAMUELIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $800,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a lawsuit filed by Donel Crespin (Plaintiff) against the County alleging negligence and premises liability. 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 $800,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	72,175
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	9,576

Case Name: Crespin, Donel, et al v. County of Los Angeles

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 31, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan On August 31, 2023, Plaintiff was moved from his assigned housing location at Men's Central Jail (MCJ) to the recreation area for his allotted recreation time. While Plaintiff was at his allotted recreation time outside of the housing module, another individual housed in a different cell within his housing module was removed from his cell for his allotted shower time. At the conclusion of his shower time, a deputy retrieved the individual to take him back to his assigned cell. The deputy inadvertently took the individual to the Plaintiff's cell, who was still at his allotted recreation time outside of the module. The individual hid in a corner of the cell. Approximately 30 minutes later, the Plaintiff returned from his allocated recreation time, escorted by a deputy from the recreation area. After placing the Plaintiff into his cell and closing the door, the individual who was placed in Plaintiff's cell accidently emerged from a hiding spot and began to assault the Plaintiff. The deputy immediately gave orders to the individual to stop fighting, utilized his OC spray, and provided aid to the Plaintiff when sufficient personnel arrived. Plaintiff was transported to Los Angeles General Hospital (LAGH) for a higher level of care.

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

The following departmental root cause was identified:

- The placement of an individual in the wrong cell.
- A blind spot located in the affected cell.

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

1). Employee review – The involved employees and incident were thoroughly reviewed by MCJ executives.

2) Administrative investigation – An administrative investigation was conducted. The employees involved received appropriate administrative action, as applicable.

3) Housing list – The module officer now prints and makes available daily a list of the individuals housed in the module and their assigned cell.

4) Cell modifications – Facilities Services Bureau investigated possible methods to reduce/eliminate the blind spot in the cell.

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) Christine M. Coles, Commander Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: CColes	Date: 5-6-26

Name: (Department Head) Tania E. Plunkett, Chief Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: TePlunkett	Date: 5-12-26

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: (Risk Management Inspector General) Betty Karmirlian	
Signature: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 5/19/26

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

Case Name: B.C vs. COLA

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: Crystal Hurtado	Date: 5/18/2026

Name: (Department Head) Stacy Lopez-Maddox	
Signature: Stacy Lopez-Maddox	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

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

May 18, 2026

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:34 a.m. The meeting was held virtually with Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro, Claims Board Member Oscar Valdez, Claims Board Member Liliana Campos, and Claims Board Administrator Thomas Finley participating in person at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Sixth Floor, Conference Room C, Los Angeles, California 90012.

All other participants at the Claims Board meeting appeared virtually: Steven M. Rich, Kevin Engelien, Caroline S. Craddock, Rachel Kleinberg, Edward A. Morrissey, Eduardo Montelongo, Stacey Y. Lee, Lauren Sible, and Vanessa Evangelista appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Melissa Lara, Lukas Bradley, and Jeff Howard appeared for the Department of Public Works. Brian Mejia and Brian Reeve appeared for the Department of Parks and Recreation. Deputy Nancy Madarasz, Lieutenant Jennifer Roth, Lieutenant Joesph Morales, Seargent Jennifer Romero, and Captain Calvin Mah appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Tosha Sweet, Karen Streich, and Vanessa Dinsay appeared for the Department of Mental Health. Kimberly Tillman and Katheryn Beigh appeared for the Probation Department. Derrick Robinson and Arnetta Counts appeared for the Department of Public Social Services. Shant Janoyan appeared for the Child Support Services Department. Tim Pescatello appeared for the Office of the District Attorney. Tom Guterres appeared for Collins + Collins, LLP. Thomas Barajas and James Sargent appeared for Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan and Shapiro, LLP. Jennifer Gysler appeared for Monroy, Averbuck & Gysler. Paul Berkowitz appeared for Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, LLP. Jeffrey M. Hausman and Daron Barsamian appeared for Hausman & Sosa, LLP

2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

No member of the public appeared in person or on the public teleconference phone line to address the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Paragraph (1) of Subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9).

At 9:35 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro announced Board Member Liliana Campos would be abstaining from Item 4(e) and convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(h).

4. Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

No member of the public appeared in person or on the public teleconference phone line to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 12:02 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session via video conference and reported the actions taken in closed session as follows:

[*Remainder of page intentionally left blank*.]

a. **Teresa Meza v. City of Temple, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23AHCV02282

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from the alleged trip and fall incident on a Department of Public Works maintained sidewalk.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(a) in the amount of $40,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

b. **Cindy Martinez v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV48314

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from the alleged trip and fall incident on a Department of Parks and Recreations maintained walkway.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(b) in the amount of $69,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

c. **Edward Larios Herrera v. Cynthia Alicia Dolson, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24PSCV01977

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(c) in the amount of $200,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

d. **K. G. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:25-cv-04754

This lawsuit concerns allegations of sexual assault by a Department of Menatal Health employee while Plaintiff was in custody at Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 4(d) to a future meeting.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

e. **Antonia Jimenez v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV03357

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Public Social Services was subjected to discrimination and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(e) in the amount of $75,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Oscar Valdez and Destiny Castro
Abstention: 1 – Liliana Campos

f. **Mitra Rashti v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC718438

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Public Works was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and that the Department failed to accommodate Plaintiff and engage in the interactive process.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(f) in the amount of $99,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

g. **Maria Rivero v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV07694

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Child Support Services Department was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(g) in the amount of $188,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

h. **Maria Ramirez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV08110

This lawsuit alleges that employees of the District Attorney's Office were subjected to retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(h) in the amount of $1,500,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

5. Approval of the Minutes of the May 4, 2026, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the May 4, 2026, meeting.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Liliana Campos, and Destiny Castro

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By _____
Thomas Finley
Claims Board Administrator
Office of the County Counsel