



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, August 3, 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 699 796 105# at 9:30 a.m. on August 3, 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, August 3, 2026, at approximately 1:05 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 699 796 105# at 1:05 p.m. on August 3, 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, July 31, 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. Estate of Roger Morales, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-10144

This lawsuit arises from the in-custody death of Decedent at Los Angeles General Medical Center; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$300,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- b. Non-Litigated Claims of Juana Navarro, et al.

These claims arise from alleged injuries Claimants sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$40,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- c. Jamie Lawson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV22192

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$175,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- d. Jose Yanez, et al. v. Travon Dajuan Skinner, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22CMCV00419

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiffs sustained in a vehicle collision that occurred when the Sheriff's Department was in pursuit of a vehicle; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$230,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- e. Carla Rodriguez v. Gerardo Marroquin, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV26508

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$5,000,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- f. 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 \$40,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- g. Mary Jane Juranek vs. Calimay Pham, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22AHCV01382

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Child Support Services Department employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$800,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- h. Robin Ruse Rinehart Barris v. Suzette Guillen, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24VECV05578

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 \$750,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- i. Yvonne Escobar, et al. v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV14825

This wrongful death lawsuit arises from the alleged negligent acts of the Aging and Disabilities Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$4,000,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- j. 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; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$99,999.

- k. Lesley Klein Sonnenberg v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV36770

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,200,000.

- l. Michael Matoba v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV17988

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,250,000.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the July 20, 2026, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

[See Supporting Document](#)

5. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Estate of Roger Morales, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-cv-10144
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	November 27, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Los Angeles Department of Correctional Health Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 300,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	CHRISTIAN CONTRERAS Law Offices of Christian Contreras. PLC HUMBERTO GUIZAR Law Offices of Humberto Guizar, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	CAROLINE S. CRADDOCK Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	Plaintiffs allege failure to summon and provide adequate medical care for Roger Morales who died in custody at the Los Angeles General Medical Center on October 26, 2023. Due to the risks and uncertainties of trial, a full and final settlement is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 118,438
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 15,812

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Non-Litigated Claims of Juana Navarro and Alfredo Navarro
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 40,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	David Cohan DC Law Group, PC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Michael Gordon Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	On September 23, 2024, a Sheriff's Department patrol car collided with Claimants Juana Navarro and Alfredo Navarro's SUV on the I-405 near Howard Hughes Parkway causing injuries for which they seek compensation. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the claim in the amount of \$40,000 is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ -0-
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ -0-

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Jamie Lawson vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	24STCV22192
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	August 30, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 175,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	BYRON ABRON, ESQ. Abron Law
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	KATHERINE ORLETSKY, ESQ. Hurrell Cantrall, LLP KEVIN ENGELIEN, ESQ. Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from a traffic collision that occurred on April 5, 2024. Plaintiff claims she 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	\$ 81,222
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 8,987



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 5, 2024
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-295 Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident. On April 5, 2024, at approximately 12:35 p.m., the Plaintiff was driving northbound on a roadway in the #3 lane and was stopped at the intersection waiting for the traffic signal to turn green. As the traffic signal turned green, the Plaintiff proceeded straight into the intersection. Simultaneously, Deputy One proceeded into the intersection in the #4 lane of travel and attempted to make an illegal left turn from a non-turning lane and collided with the Plaintiff's vehicle. The Los Angeles Police Department responded to the scene and investigated the collision. A nearby liquor store, had low quality footage of the collision occurring. The footage depicted the patrol vehicle making a left turn and collide with the Plaintiff's vehicle. The investigation determined Deputy One was at fault for causing the collision due to making an unsafe left turn into the Plaintiff's vehicle in violation of California Vehicle Code Section 22107. Los Angeles County Fire Department paramedics responded to the scene of the collision. Deputy One and the Plaintiff were transported to a local hospital for treatment of their injuries.

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

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One made an unsafe left turn and collided into the plaintiff's vehicle.

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One was seen using her cellular phone while driving a vehicle.

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 the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). The investigating officers determined the primary collision factor to be an unsafe left turn in violation of California Vehicle code Section 22107.

Administrative Investigation

This incident was thoroughly investigated by representatives at Transit Services Bureau. Executive evaluation of this incident found some of Deputy One's actions were in violation of Department policy. Appropriate administrative action was taken and the deputy attended additional training.

Traffic Collision Assessment Review

In an attempt to improve employee safety and reduce the Department's liability exposure, Transit Services Bureau continually schedules personnel to attend the Emergency Vehicle Operations Center (EVOC) training.

Sheriff Department Announcement - Department Wide Re-brief:

The purpose of this re-brief is to remind Department personnel that the safety of Department members and the public is paramount when engaged in routine driving and Code-3 responses.

Department-Wide Broadcast Announcements - Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC):

In an effort to mitigate Department traffic collisions, Risk Management Bureau has partnered with Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC) to create Department-Wide safety announcements that are broadcast each shift.

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: 6-16-26

Name: (Department Head)	
Brandon R. Dean, Chief Special Operations Division	
Signature: 	Date: 6-22-26

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: 6/25/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Jose Yanez, et al. v. Travon Dajuan Skinner, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22CMCV00419
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 3, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 230,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	ALEXANDER J. ZEESMAN, ESQ Accident Fighters, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	LATASHA N. CORRY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on October 25, 2021, when a Department pursuit of a vehicle led to a collision with Plaintiffs' vehicle at the intersection of the Westbound I-105 freeway and Vermont Avenue, in the City of Los Angeles. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 146,753
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 15,281



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 25, 2001, at approximately 7:16 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-296 Based on multiple investigative reports, on October 25, 2021, at approximately 7:50 p.m., the Plaintiffs were driving southbound on an avenue past the on ramp to the Westbound Interstate 105 Freeway when they were struck by a vehicle being driven by a Suspect being pursued by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputies. Deputies One and Two observed the Suspect driving recklessly and believed the driver was under the influence of alcohol or marijuana. As the Deputies attempted to initiate a traffic stop, the Suspect accelerated and drove onto the 105 Freeway. The pursuit lasted approximately two minutes before the Suspect drove through a red traffic signal exiting the freeway and collided with the Plaintiffs' vehicle traveling westbound through a green traffic signal. Los Angeles County Fire Department paramedics responded and transported the Plaintiffs to a local hospital for treatment of their injuries. Deputies One and Two were not involved in the collision. The Suspect was arrested for driving under the influence of drugs and evading a police officer in a willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property and subsequently sentenced to five years in State Prison.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Deputies initiated a vehicle pursuit due to the Suspect's reckless driving and possible impairment.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Suspect's failure to yield when Deputies attempted to conduct a lawful traffic stop.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the Suspect's failure to stop for a red traffic signal prior to entering an intersection and colliding with the Plaintiff's vehicle.

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 representatives from the California Highway Patrol, West Los Angeles Station. The collision investigation concluded the Suspect caused the collision with the Plaintiff's vehicle.


Administrative Investigation

This incident was investigated to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred in relation to the vehicle pursuit and subsequent traffic collision. Executive evaluation of this incident found that the deputies' conduct related to the vehicle pursuit adhered to Department policy.

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: 6-16-26

Name: (Department Head)	
Yolanda R. Figueroa, Chief Central Patrol Division	
Signature: 	Date: 6/18/2026

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: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)

Signature:

Betty Karmirlian

Date:

6/18/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Carla Rodriguez vs. Gerardo Marroquin, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22STCV26508
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	August 16, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 5,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	DENIS ALEXANDROFF, ESQ. Law Offices of Denis Alexandroff
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	LATASHA N. CORRY Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from a traffic collision that occurred on May 12, 2022. Plaintiff claims she suffered injuries and damages as a result of the collision. Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 91,799
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 138,798



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 12, 2022
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan On May 12, 2022, at approximately 1:20 PM, an on-duty Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriff was driving a department issued unmarked vehicle eastbound on State Route 2 (Glendale Freeway) near State Route 134 (Ventura Freeway) in Los Angeles, when they were involved in a traffic collision. The deputy was traveling in the #1 lane at up to 81 miles per hour in a 65 miles per hour zone. Ahead, a large Cal Trans truck was at the rear of a cleaning convoy. The deputy believed the truck was fully in the shoulder and that the truck could be safely passed. As the deputy approached, however, they realized at least a portion of the truck was in the # 1 lane. The deputy applied their brakes and veered to the right but was unable to avoid a collision with the rear attenuator attached to the truck. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) responded to the incident and conducted a traffic crash report. Their investigation determined the deputy to be primarily at fault. Specifically, they determined the deputy violated California Vehicle Code §22350 – Speed Limit.

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

The following departmental root cause was identified:

- The deputy operating their vehicle in an unsafe manner – specifically, operating their vehicle at a speed above the posted speed limit.

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 department executives.
- 2) Traffic Collision Investigation – Both CHP and the department investigated the cause of the traffic collision.
- 3) Administrative Investigation – This incident was investigated to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The results of the investigation were presented for Department executive review. Appropriate administrative action was taken.
- 4) Training – Driver training was provided to the involved deputy.

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)	
Brian A. Tolmasoff, Commander Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: 	Date: 6-18-2026

Name: (Department Head)	
Tania E. Plunkett, Chief Custody Services Division – Specialized Programs	
Signature: 	Date: 6-18-26

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: 	Date: 7/9/26

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	\$ 40,000
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 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	\$ 25,193
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 215

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Mary Jane Juranek vs. Calimay Pham, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22AHCV01382
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	December 23, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Child Support Services Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 800,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	TODD F. NEVELL, ESQ. SCOLINOS, SHELDON, & NEVELL, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	LATASHA N. CORRY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from a traffic collision that occurred on December 30, 2020. Plaintiff claims she 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	\$ 84,570
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0



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:	December 30, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On December 30, 2020, at approximately 7:29 am, the Plaintiff was crossing in a marked crosswalk in the city of Alhambra, CA. At the same time, the Defendant was at the stop sign at the intersection of where the Plaintiff was crossing. Defendant was on her way to a court hearing at the Central Civil West Courthouse from her home as part of her job duties as a staff attorney for the Child Support Services Department. The Defendant was attempting to make a left turn from behind the stop sign when she hit the Plaintiff with the left side of her vehicle as Plaintiff crossed the crosswalk. Prior to the collision, Defendant stated she checked for oncoming traffic in both directions, didn't see any oncoming traffic, and stopped when she heard a bump on the left side of her vehicle. When the Defendant exited the vehicle, she found Plaintiff on the ground to the left side of her car. Plaintiff was then transported by ambulance to the hospital for further care and evaluation as she had visible injuries. Plaintiff received medial treatment for injuries sustained in the accident.

	Note: Defendant left CSSD employment in December 2023, when she transferred to another County department. CSSD first learned of the accident in late 2023, when Plaintiff filed a claim against the County. Therefore, CSSD was unable to complete an investigation into the incident.
--	--

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

Pedestrian v. Motor Vehicle Accident : Defendant failed to ensure pedestrian clearance before making a left turn.

The Defendant (previous CSSD employee) was on her way (driving) to a court hearing at the Central Civil West Courthouse from her home as part of her job duties as a staff attorney for the department. While driving, Defendant attempted to make a left turn from behind a stop sign when she ended up hitting the Plaintiff as the Plaintiff crossed the sidewalk. Prior to the collision, Defendant stated she checked for oncoming traffic in both directions before hitting the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff was received medical treatment for her injuries.

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

Step Number 1: During new hire on boarding, Human Resources will identify employee's who are required to drive as part of their regular and/or occasional job duties. HR will ensure that each employee read and sign the Mileage Certification Form. The Mileage Permittee Certification of Receipt form (which certifies that you read and received copies of County of LA – Information and Instructions for Permittee Drivers and Evidence Financial Responsibility) will be incorporated as part of the Department's procedure. Furthermore, employee's will be informed they are required to complete an "Incident Report" if involved in an accident as referenced in CSSD Policy – 2 00 00.

Step Number 2: CSSD will send out a safety guide to all staff semi-annually that highlights safe driving trends and tips. This communication will provide valuable insight into current best practices for safe driving, including reminders about defensive driving techniques. By sharing this information regularly, we aim to reinforce our commitment to safety and encourage all employees to adopt responsible and safe driving habits.

Step Number 3: CSSD on a quarterly basis will review internal records and identify any reported driving incidents involving employees within the Department. The Department will also review each reported incident, if any, to assess the circumstance, determine if it was preventable, identify root causes, and recommend appropriate administrative actions based on the findings, if appropriate. This will also involve monitoring any changes and promptly addressing them to mitigate risks effectively. We aim to enhance safety measures and reduce future incidents.

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) Lana Ghil	
Signature: 	Date: 6/12/2026

Name: (Department Head) Genie Chough	
Signature: 	Date: 6/15/2026

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: 	Date: 6/16/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Robin Ruse Rinehart Barris v. Suzette Guillen, et al
CASE NUMBER	24VECV05578
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	November 12, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 750,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	KELLEY J. LAZAROVITS, ESQ. Gilbert & Stern, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA A. MCCAVERY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from an auto v. pedestrian in a crosswalk collision that occurred on January 25, 2023. Plaintiff claims she 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	\$ 42,565
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 44,277



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:	January 25, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	The Plaintiff claims to have suffered multiple physical injuries due to being struck by a DCFS employee's vehicle while crossing a crosswalk.

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

On January 25, 2023, the DCFS employee was on their personal cell phone while making a left turn and struck a pedestrian who was walking in a crosswalk.

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


On or about May 1, 2025, DCFS began requiring all mileage permittees to complete Defensive Driver training biennially. On October 20, 2025, and November 7, 2025, the Department issued memos to all mileage permittees informing them of this new biennial training requirement. The Department reviewed this incident and the DCFS employee was required to attend and has completed the County's Defensive Driver training course.

On April 22, 2025, the County Chief Executive Office released a Safety Bulletin on Distracted Driving. The Department shared this bulletin with its workforce on May 1, 2025.


On February 11, 2016, DCFS' Policy Institute released Management Directive (#16-01) "Use of Cellular Phones" to inform DCFS employees of legal requirements and countywide policies/protocols regarding the use of County-issued and personal cellular phones during the course of their work. The Department will update the Management Directive, include any legislative updates including the "No Touch" California Vehicle Code 23123.5 update, and reissue the renewed version to all staff by the close of 2026.

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) Veronica Pawlowski	
Signature: 	Date: 6/17/2026

Name: (Department Head) Brandon T. Nichols, Director	
Signature: 	Date: 07/02/26

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: 	Date: 7/7/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Yvonne Escobar, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles
CASE NUMBER	22STCV14825
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	May 5, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Aging and Disabilities
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 4,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	RICHARD LARA, ESQ. Lara Law Firm, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	JESSIE LEE Senior Deputy County Counsel Social Services Division
	JENNIFER GYSLER, ESQ. Monroy, Averbuck and Gysler
NATURE OF CASE	Plaintiff alleges wrongful death, survival action, and negligent retention due to her adult brother fatally stabbing their mother after involvement with Adult Protective Services. Due to the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 89,616
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 19,124



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 5, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Plaintiff filed a wrongful death action against the Aging and Disabilities Department alleging that Adult Protective Services (APS) received reports of her brother's physical abuse of their mother. Plaintiff alleges APS failed to properly investigate and report abuse of their mother. On May 5, 2020, plaintiff's brother fatally stabbed their mother.

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

The root causes of this lawsuit are related to factors of lacking oversight, case handling and processing. More specifically:

- Case oversight lacked efficient active monitoring and managerial oversight including maintaining communication with involved entities. Employee did not meet internal review guidelines and had delayed response and documentation. Employee had a high caseload.
- Lack of policies related to investigating and handling cases related to physical abuse/domestic violence and mental health illness.
- Case oversight did not include utilization of additional resources including referring to the Center of Excellence for a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) approach.
- Lack of timely cross reporting to law enforcement.

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

Case Management and Oversight

The department's case tracking system will be modified to create specific identifications for cases related to domestic violence and mental health illness. This will allow for specific tracking and monitoring of these priority cases. Management will run reports using this new identification to monitor case progress and ensure proper facilitation and handling. Management will conduct bi-weekly reviews to ensure case management is proceeding in the most efficient and effective means available. These will allow management to provide specific oversight and ensure proper case documentation and recurring case review as needed.

The Department is also currently evaluating several changes to address caseload issues including recently created specialized unit to address older pending cases, evaluating the intake process and related contract, evaluating the implementation of a decision-making tool and working with other County social work departments to implement their best practices.

Policy Development

A policy has been created to mandate use of the two new work action flags/ special designation fields within the case management system. Policy also establishes strict safety planning and law enforcement consultation protocols for all cases involving domestic violence or suspected abusers, family or household members with mental health issues.

The policy requires social workers to develop a safety plan and document the consultation with law enforcement within 24 hours of the initial home visit for all high-risk cases involving suspected abusers with a history of chronic mental instability or ongoing violence. The safety plan will also include an evaluation and referral to a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT).

Management Oversight and Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) Approach

Ensuring these cases are referred to the Center of Excellence for a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) approach helps ensure a diverse comprehensive approach in handling. The newly established intake identification, reporting mechanism and related policy will support the management oversight approach and will help in facilitating a long-term case management strategy including an MDT approach as applicable.

Automation of Law Enforcement Cross-Reporting

The department is working with local law enforcement agencies and the Department of Children Family Services to evaluate the ability to automate referrals to law enforcement.

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) Derrick Martin	
Signature: <i>Derrick Martin</i>	Date: 07/02/2026

Name: (Department Head) Maral Karaccusian	
Signature: <i>Maral Karaccusian</i>	Date: 07/02/2026

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: <i>Betty Karmirlian</i>	Date: 7/2/26

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

July 20, 2026

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:37 a.m. The meeting was held virtually with Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro, Claims Board Member Liliana Campos, Claims Board Member Oscar Valdez, 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: LaTasha Corry, Richard Hsueh, Melissa McCaverty, Kevin Engelen, Jessie Lee, Katherine Bowser, Stacey Lee, Kent Sommer, and Vanessa Evangelista appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Stanley S. Yen appeared for the Department of Mental Health. Ronald Castaneda, Jacklin Injijian, Rosemarie Brazal, Sterling Klippel, Lukas Bradley, and Tommy (Yiu) Lau appeared for the Department of Public Works. Shant Janoyan appeared for the Child Support Services Department. Julie Dixon Silva appeared for the Office of the District Attorney. Veronica Sigala, Alejandro Ostos, and Derrick Martin appeared for the Aging & Disabilities Department. Richard Sigur, Clinton Yates, Deputy Nancy Madarasz, Captain Ryan Vienna, Captain Chris Kusayanagi, Commander Robert Jones II, Sergeant Jennifer Romero, Sergeant Varand Minassian, Lieutenant Jennifer Roth, and Chief Yolanda Figueroa appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Sanaz Rashidi appeared for Hurrell Cantrall, LLP. Jennifer Gysler appeared for Monroy, Averbuck & Gysler. Ali Ziai appeared for Lawrence Beach Allen & Choi, PC. Jill Williams appeared for Carpenter, Rothans & Dumont. Angelica Victoria O. De Mesa appeared for Collins + Collins, LLP. Nohemi Ferguson appeared for Gutierrez Preciado & House, LLP. Thomas Barajas appeared for Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan and Shapiro, 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.

Two unidentified members of the public appeared on the public teleconference phone line but did not respond to the opportunity to address the Claims Board. No member of the public appeared in person.

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

At 9:38 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro convened the meeting in closed session to discuss items 3(a) through 3(j).

Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

On the public teleconference phone line, one unidentified caller and two callers who self-identified as "Christopher Lara" and "Jocelyn Olivares" were present to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 12:55 p.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in closed session as follows:

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

a. **Joanne Capitano v. Thien Huong Nguyen, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23AHCV00720

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in an automobile collision involving a Department of Public Work's employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(a) in the amount of \$1,150,000.

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

b. **Interinsurance Exchange of the Automobile Club (a/s/o Garlan Wong) v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**; **Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 25PSCV00914**

This dangerous condition and inverse condemnation lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from a tree falling causing property damage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(b) in the amount of \$135,000.

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

c. **Elena Cardenas vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWCV02750

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff 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 3(c) in the amount of \$145,000.

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

d. **Daniel Alexander Blake vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24NNCV03778

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff 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 3(d) in the amount of \$200,000.

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

**e. Jazmine Moreno, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:21-CV-06062**

This wrongful death lawsuit arises from the fatal shooting of Decedent by the Sheriff's Department.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(e) in the amount of \$12,500,000.

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

**f. Mary Jane Juranek vs. Calimay Pham, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22AHCV01382**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Child Support Services Department employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 3(f) to a future meeting.

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

**g. Yvonne Escobar, et al. v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV14825**

This wrongful death lawsuit arises from the alleged negligent acts of the Aging and Disabilities Department.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 3(g) to a future meeting.

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

**h. Alma Lopez v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV00579**

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Mental Health was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(h) in the amount of \$30,000.

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

i. **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.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(i) in the amount of \$40,000.

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

j. **Isidoro Baly v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV31110

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(e) in the amount of \$1,300,000.

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

4. **Approval of the Minutes of the July 6, 2026, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the July 6, 2026, meeting.

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

5. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:57 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By



Thomas Finley
Claims Board Administrator
Office of the County Counsel