



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
Adrienne M. Byers
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

The Los Angeles County Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, March 3, 2025, 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 939 704 376# at 9:30 a.m. on March 3, 2025.

Reports of actions taken in Closed Session. The Los Angeles County Claims Board will report actions taken on any Closed Session Items on Monday, March 3, 2025, at approximately 11:15 a.m. Members of the public who would like to hear reportable actions taken on any Closed Session items may call (323) 776-6996, then enter ID 939 704 376# at 11:15 a.m. on March 3, 2025. 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 comment or documentation must be submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. on Friday, February 28, 2025. 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 a security guard will escort you to the Sixth Floor where you will 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 Secretary Laura Z. Salazar at lzalazar@counsel.lacounty.gov or 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 – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Government Code section 54956.9, subdivision (a)).

a. Non-Litigated Claim of Las Flores Apartments LLC

This inverse condemnation claim against the Department of Public Works contends that a residential property was damaged due to backflow of sewage from a sewer mainline blockage; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$46,398.64.

[See Supporting Document](#)

b. Non-Litigated Claims of Erik D. Simonsen and Dina G. Simonsen

These inverse condemnation claims against the Department of Public Works contend that a sewer mainline blockage and subsequent spill caused damage to Claimants' property; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$55,929.

[See Supporting Document](#)

c. Mark G. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-cv-04641

This federal civil rights lawsuit alleges that the Department of Children and Family Services wrongfully detained Plaintiff's children; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$35,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

d. Lailah Yoon v. Mark Stonich, et al.
Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2023-01348655-CU-PA-NJC

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department lieutenant; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$59,500.

[See Supporting Document](#)

e. Alma Cervantes v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-cv-07764

This federal civil rights lawsuit resulted from Plaintiff's arrest by Sheriff's Department deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$300,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- f. Alondra Sandoval v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV07967

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Sheriff's Department was subjected to discrimination and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$40,000.

- g. Non-Litigated Claim of Delinia Leguie
CRD: 20304-2179905 / EEOC: 37A-20223-0211

This discrimination complaint filed with the Civil Rights Department alleges that an employee of Child Support Services Department was subjected to disability discrimination and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$350,000.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the February 3, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

[See Supporting Document](#)

5. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Non-Litigated Claim of Las Flores Apartments LLC
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 46,398.64
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Robert Glushon, Esq. Luna & Glushon
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Ann M. Aguilar Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This claim alleges damage to residential property due to a backflow of sewage from a sewer mainline blockage. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the matter is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Non-Litigated Claims of Erik D. Simonsen and Dina G. Simonsen
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 55,929.00
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	N/A
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Mark W. Lomax, Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This claim involves property damage from a sewage spill caused by a sewer mainline blockage. Due to the risk and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ -0-
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ -0-

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Mark G., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-CV-04641
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	October 23, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Shawn McMillan, Esq. The Law Offices of Shawn A. McMillan
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	THOMAS FAGAN Principal Deputy County Counsel Social Services Division JENNIFER GYSLER Monroy, Averbuck & Gysler
NATURE OF CASE	Plaintiff alleges the Department of Children and Family Services wrongfully detained his children, violating his rights. 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	\$ 30,300
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ None

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Lailah Yoon vs. Mark Stonich, et al.
CASE NUMBER	30-2023-01348655-CU-PA-NJC
COURT	Orange County Superior Court
DATE FILED	September 12, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 59,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	EDWARD W. HESS, JR., ESQ. PHILLIP B. NGHIEM, ESQ. Hess & Nghiem
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA McCAVERTY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on June 22, 2023, when a Sheriff's Department employee rear-ended Plaintiff's vehicle at the interesection of Imperial Highway and Beach Boulevard, in the City of La Habra.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 36,488
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 7,015

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Alma Cervantes v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-cv-07764
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	October 25, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 300,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Daniel C. Sharpe, Esq. Windsor Troy
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$300,000, inclusive of attorney's fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Alma Cervantes following her arrest by Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Deputies.</p> <p>Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. The full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$300,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 175,824
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 29,343



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 18, 2022
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2023-135</p> <p>On January 18, 2022, at approximately 6:00 a.m., a vehicle was stolen from a gas station in Industry Station's jurisdiction. The responding deputy obtained a description of the suspect from surveillance footage, along with a description of the vehicle. The suspect was described as a female, wearing a black hooded sweater, a dark gray sweater, gray pants, and carrying a black backpack. Additionally, a witness saw the vehicle drive into a nearby parking lot where two males entered the car.</p> <p>Later that morning, Deputy One saw the stolen vehicle driving westbound. Deputy One initially lost sight of the vehicle, before relocating it parked at a nearby 7-Eleven. There was no one in the vehicle, and he did not see anyone exit the car.</p> <p>As Deputy One was "recovering" the vehicle, Deputies Two and Three drove by and offered to help. While Deputies Two and Three continued to process the car, Deputy One entered the 7-Eleven to view surveillance footage.</p> <p>The footage showed the driver (suspect) of the stolen car to be a female wearing a dark hooded jacket, light-colored jeans, and dark shoes. She was not carrying a backpack. The suspect also removed her jacket inside the store to reveal a short-sleeved shirt with jersey digits on the back and writing on the front. She was determined to have light-colored hair.</p> <p>The suspect was accompanied by a male wearing a baseball cap, light-colored jeans, dark jacket, dark shoes, with no facial hair. He was carrying a large backpack. The suspect was approximately 5 feet tall and 120 pounds. The male passenger was approximately 6 feet tall and 240 pounds.</p> <p>Due to poor quality video and buffering issues during playback, Deputy One only watched a portion of the video.</p> <p>After approximately 15 minutes, Deputies Two and Three saw a male and a female near a street corner who matched the general physical description of the suspect. They sent a picture via text message to Deputy One who was inside 7-Eleven, as they thought she could be the suspect. Deputy One asked Deputies Two and Three to detain them.</p> <p>The Plaintiff was wearing a long-sleeved shirt and black pants with a backpack. The male she was with was wearing a hat, black pants, a black shirt and had facial hair.</p>

	<p>Deputies Two and Three subsequently detained the Plaintiff and the male. While the Plaintiff was cooperative, the male smelled of alcohol and was hostile toward the deputies and kept calling them “bitches.” Deputy Two handcuffed the Plaintiff and placed her in the back of their patrol car. She then assisted Deputy Three in handcuffing the male. Deputies Two and Three were joined by Deputy Four. The male was placed in the back of Deputy Four’s patrol vehicle.</p> <p>Deputy One arrived and began to question Plaintiff about her whereabouts that morning. She stated she was at a nearby car audio shop where she left her daughter’s car and offered to show a receipt as proof. Incident to arrest, Deputy Four searched the Plaintiff’s purse and located a set of Toyota car keys and a receipt. The keys appeared to be “shaven” and were consistent with the type of keys commonly used to steal vehicles.</p> <p>Deputy One asked the Plaintiff about the keys for which she mistakenly denied ownership. Although the keys were later determined to belong to her husband, her initial denial aroused the suspicion of Deputy One. Deputy One subsequently questioned the male who also said they had been at a car audio shop and offered the receipt in Plaintiff’s purse as proof.</p> <p>Deputy One arrested the Plaintiff in violation of California Penal Code Section 487(D)(1), Grand Theft Auto based on several factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The Plaintiff and the male being near the 7-Eleven and the stolen vehicle.2) He believed the Plaintiff and the male matched the description to the persons seen in the video.3) The video showed a female exiting from the driver’s door of the stolen vehicle. <p>Deputy One did not investigate the receipt or Plaintiff’s alibi further. It was unclear if Deputy One tested the “shaved” keys in the stolen vehicle. The receipt was left in the Plaintiff’s purse and never booked into evidence.</p> <p>Deputies Two and Three transported the Plaintiff to Industry Station where she was booked and released with a citation later that day. The male was not charged with a crime and released at the scene.</p> <p>The following day, Deputy One and a station detective separately viewed the 7-Eleven surveillance video on video monitors inside Industry Station. It was apparent that the Plaintiff was not the suspect depicted in the video. That same day, the detective called the Plaintiff and asked her to return to the station. He issued her a Certificate of Release/Clearance Letter pursuant to California Penal Code Section 849(b)(1).</p>
--	--

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

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One erroneously arrested the Plaintiff for possession of a stolen vehicle.

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One did not conduct a thorough investigation and ignored potentially exculpatory evidence.

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputies Two and Three were not wearing their Department-issued body-worn cameras at the time of the incident.

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

Administrative Investigation

The incident was investigated by Industry Station supervisors to determine if any criminal or administrative misconduct occurred. Appropriate administrative action was taken.

Involved Personnel Training

The involved deputies received training pertaining to the circumstances of this incident.

Constitutional Policing Briefings

Industry Station supervisors have conducted briefings with personnel from all shifts to discuss issues related to the 4th and 14th Amendment rights of individuals, and to refresh their understanding of report writing, detention, and lawful arrest.

Body-Worn Camera (BWC)

From June to Sept 2022, Industry Station supervisors conducted briefings with personnel from all shifts regarding Manual of Policy and Procedures Section 3-016/200.08 Body Worn Cameras, to remind personnel of the Department's expectations concerning the use and activation of Department-issued body-worn cameras

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)


Julia Valdes, A/Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:



Date:

01/14/2025

Name: (Department Head) Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff Patrol Operations	
Signature: 	Date: <i>1/28/25</i>

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 (Acting Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: <i>Betty Karmirlian</i>	Date: 1/28/2025

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 3, 2025

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:47 a.m. The meeting was held virtually with Claims Board Members Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Chair Destiny Castro participating in person at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Fifth Floor, Conference Room 525, Los Angeles, California 90012.

All other participants at the Claims Board meeting appeared virtually: Michael Gordon, Mark Lomax, Jonathan Brazile, Kevin Engelen, Michael Owens, Timothy Kral, Minas Samuelian, Stacey Lee, Anthony Morrone, and Claims Board Secretary Laura Z. Salazar appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Jacklin Injijian, Michele Chimienti, Ronald Castaneda, Andrew Ngumba, and Keegan Fahey appeared for the Department of Public Works. Marian Bellard, Kevin Nguyen, and Minh Le appeared for the Internal Services Department. Commander Christine M. Coles, Sergeant Ismael Opina, Acting Lieutenant Freddy Q. Brown, Commander Brandon R. Dean, Captain Marco A. Soto, Lieutenant Daniel Rodriguez, Deputy Nancy K. Madarasz, Lieutenant Thomas V. Kim, Chief Jose G. Mendoza, Lieutenant Jennifer M. Roth, and Captain Chris M. Kusayanagi appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Taneisha Franklin appeared for the Department of Mental Health. Justin Kimura, Simone Agee, and Ruth Gibson appeared for the Department of Public Social Services. Niall A. Fordyce and Dan D. Hoffman appeared for Collins + Collins, LLP. Mark Worthge appeared for Litchfield Cavo. Andrew Baum appeared for Glaser Weil Fink Howard Avchen & Shapiro, LLP. Marina Sampson appeared for Ivie, McNeill, Wyatt, Purcell & Diggs, LLP. Avi Burkwitz appeared for Peterson Bradford Burkwitz Gregorio Burkwitz & Su LLP. Jeffrey Hausman appeared for Hausman & Sosa.

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.

There was an unidentified member of the public who appeared on the public teleconference phone line but did not respond to the opportunity to address the Claims Board.

3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Government Code section 54956.9, subdivision (a)).

At 9:47 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(k).

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 12:53 p.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session to report the actions taken in closed session as follows:

a. Richard R. Salazar v. City of Citrus, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV14933

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained when his motorcycle crashed in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(a) in the amount of \$50,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

b. Non-Litigated Claims of Xi Lin Chen and Yan Lu

These inverse condemnation claims against the Department of Public Works arise from a sewer mainline blockage and spill that occurred at two properties in unincorporated Stevenson Ranch resulting in property damage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(b) in the amount of \$54,258.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

c. Christensen Bros. Gen. Eng., Inc. v. LA County Waterworks District No. 40, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV35076

This breach of contract lawsuit seeks damages against the Department of Public Works for costs incurred on an improvement project for the installation of a water-main pipeline in Lancaster.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(c) in the amount of \$295,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

d. Gregorio Pina, et al. v. Rosa Mora, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC027157

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from alleged injuries sustained in a traffic collision due to icy road conditions in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(d) in the amount of \$2,350,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

e. Leopoldo Noriega, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV12091

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a traffic collision involving an Internal Services Department employee and a pedestrian walking through a crosswalk.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(e) in the amount of \$100,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

f. Non-Litigated Tax Claims of Garcia and Ramirez

These two tax claims brought by two sets of property owners allegedly impacted by fraudulent behavior of home improvement contractors under the County's PACE program seek compensation for incomplete construction.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(f) in the amounts of \$92,000 and \$35,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

**g. Rodney Cullors, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No 20STCV16414**

This class action lawsuit alleges that the County of Los Angeles failed to adequately protect inmates in the County jails from COVID.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(g) in the amount of \$99,500.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

**h. Jesus Avitia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV44681**

This state civil rights lawsuit arises from Sheriff's Department deputies' alleged use of deadly force against Plaintiffs' son.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(h) in the amount of \$350,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

**i. Lisa Vargas v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:19-cv-03279**

This federal civil rights lawsuit arises from the death of Plaintiff's son after Sheriff's Department deputies attempted to take Decedent into custody.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(i) in the amount of \$3,000,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Oscar Valdez, and Destiny Castro
Noes: 1 – Adrienne M. Byers

**j. Erica Folinsky v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV24605**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Mental Health was subjected to disability discrimination and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(j) in the amount of \$150,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

**k. Guillermo Arce v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV03801**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Public Social Services was subjected to disability discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(k) in the amount of \$50,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Oscar Valdez, and Adrienne M. Byers
Recusal: 1 – Destiny Castro

5. Approval of the Minutes of the January 6, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the January 6, 2025, meeting.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Oscar Valdez, Adrienne M. Byers, and Destiny Castro

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:54 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By



Laura Z. Salazar
Claims Board Secretary