



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 2, 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 932 341 061# at 9:30 a.m. on March 2, 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, March 2, 2026, at approximately 12:45 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 932 341 061# at 12:45 p.m. on March 2, 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, February 27, 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 (Government Code section 54956.9, subdivision (a)).

- a. E. Arcineaga, et al. v. Los Angeles County, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV46931

This medical malpractice lawsuit alleges that Los Angeles General Medical Center failed to adequately treat a minor; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$250,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- b. Non-Litigated Claim of MYK Properties, LLC

This inverse condemnation claim against the Department of Public Works contends that Claimants' property was damaged by sewage backflow due to a mainline blockage; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$55,520.13.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- c. Los Angeles Waterkeeper, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCP02608

This writ action alleges that the Department of Public Works failed to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$95,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- d. Valerie Olvera v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23CHCV01878

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Parks and Recreation employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$60,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- e. Ismael Carbajal v. L.A. County Fire Department, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV02846

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained when two tires detached from a Fire Department truck and struck Plaintiff's vehicle; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$2,000,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- f. Lila C. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-02825

This lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff's civil rights were violated by the Department of Children and Family Services when Plaintiff was abused in foster care; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$99,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- g. Marlen Medina v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-05277

This federal wrongful death lawsuit stems from the overdose death of Plaintiff's decedent while in custody at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$2,500,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- h. PACE Tax Claim of Galavis

This is a tax claim brought by a property owner alleging fraudulent behavior of home improvement contractors of the Los Angeles County's Property Assessed Clean Energy Program; settlement is recommended in the amount of up to \$52,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- i. Daniel Saldana v. Martha Donovan, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-00895

This federal civil rights lawsuit arises from the alleged wrongful conviction and imprisonment of Plaintiff for 33 years; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$3,700,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- j. Alison Oley v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV29986

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Sheriff's Department was subjected to sexual harassment and emotional distress; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$700,000.

- k. Art Hernandez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV33158

This lawsuit alleges that current and former deputies from the Sheriff's Department were harassed and discriminated against by other former deputies who were members of the Banditos gang; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$8,000,000.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the February 2, 2026, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

[See Supporting Document](#)

5. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	E. Arciniega, a minor individual by and through her Guardian Ad Litem, Joel Arciniega v Los Angeles County, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV46931
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	December 23, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Health Services Los Angeles General Medical Center
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	JOHN CARPENTER Carpenter & Zuckerman
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	NARBEH BAGDASARIAN Principal Deputy County Counsel Health Services Division
NATURE OF CASE	<p>On December 25, 2020, E. Arciniega, a minor, was brought to Los Angeles General Medical Center (LA General) after being involved in a vehicle accident. Through her Guardian-ad-Litem, E. Arciniega filed a medical malpractice lawsuit against the County of Los Angeles alleging that LA General staff failed to adequately treat her injuries.</p> <p>Considering the uncertainties of trial, the County decided to settle the case.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 72,923
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 30,556

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Los Angeles Waterkeeper and the Center for Biological Diversity vs. County of Los Angeles and Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and Los Angeles County Flood Control District
CASE NUMBER	22STCP02608
COURT	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
DATE FILED	July 13, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 95,000
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS	Amy Minter, Esq. Michelle N. Black, Esq. Sunjana Supekar, Esq. Benjamin Harris, Esq. Aruna Prabhala, Esq. Frances Tinney, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Lauren E. Dods
NATURE OF CASE	Alleged CEQA Violations
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 389,778
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 520

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Valerie Olvera v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	23CHCV01878
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	June 27, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Parks and Recreation
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 60,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	DANIEL J. RAFII, ESQ. Rafii & Associates
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA A. MCCAERTY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on August 8, 2022, when a Parks and Recreation employee made a left turn exiting a driveway and collided into Plaintiff's vehicle. Plaintiff claims to have suffered injuries and damages from the incident.</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	\$ 31,233
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 14,840

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Ismael Carbajal v. L.A. County Fire Department, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22STCV02846
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	January 24, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Fire Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 2,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	GARY DORDICK, ESQ. Dordick Law Corporation
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA A. MCCAERTY Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This incident occurred on September 29, 2021, when a Los Angeles County Fire Department vehicle had two of its tires become detached and roll into traffic striking the vehicle Plaintiff was driving. Plaintiff alleges he sustained injuries and damages.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$2,000,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 92,003
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 102,148



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:	September 29, 2021
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>On September 29, 2021, a Fire Fighting Construction Equipment Operator (FFCEO), was driving eastbound on State Route Highway 126 at Chiquito Canyon Road in the City of Castaic in a 2017 Dodge Ram 4500 ("Dozer Tender") when he felt a vibration.</p> <p>The Dozer Tender dropped towards the left corner and began to veer out of control. The FFCEO slowed down, gained control, and slowly drove towards the right shoulder of the road. As the Dozer Tender was coming to a stop, two tires dislodged from the Dozer Tender and rolled eastbound on the highway. As vehicles swerved to avoid the rolling tires, one of the tires hit another oncoming vehicle.</p> <p>At the same time, Plaintiff was driving westbound on State Route Highway 126, in the far-right lane and observed two tires bouncing towards his vehicle. Plaintiff was driving a 2005 Ford Explorer and was traveling approximately 55 to 60 MPH (the speed limit at this location is 60 MPH). Plaintiff applied his brakes, but one of the tires struck the front of his truck. The truck pulled to the left, crossed all lanes, rolled over, and came to rest on its side near the guardrail.</p> <p>Plaintiff was wearing his seatbelt at the time of the accident and was able to self-extricate from his vehicle. There was no airbag deployment and Plaintiff was ambulatory at the scene. He was transported BLS to the hospital by ambulance where he complained of pain to his head, neck, and back. He was prescribed medication and released later that day.</p> <p>CHP also responded to this incident. The CHP investigation determined the Dozer's left rear tire wheel nuts stripped from the bolts causing the tires to detach.</p>

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

The Dozer Tender's left rear tire wheel lug nuts stripped from the studs.


The FFCEO failed to recognize signs of loose lug nuts or wheel during an apparatus check on the morning of the incident.


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

<p>1. The Department now requires that lug nuts must be torqued to manufacturing specs by qualified personnel. Thus, when tires are changed in the field by vehicle operators, a final torque must be completed by Fleet Mechanics with calibrated wrenches.</p> <p>The maintenance of the wheels and tires as well as ensuring the lug nuts were properly secured to the wheel studs is the responsibility of the Department. This was completed in August 2025.</p> <p>2. Training to remind vehicle operators to use a star pattern wrench when tightening wheel lug nuts. Additionally, reinforce re-torque policy at 50-100 miles after wheels have been serviced or changed. This was completed by December 2025.</p> <p>3. The Department initiated an internal investigation into the incident on November 14, 2022. The Department reviewed the incident and determined that the FFCEO appropriately conducted the requisite visual inspections of the wheels and tires (including the rims and lug nuts) for the entire month of September 2021. Given this and his personnel history, he was issued a Notice of Instruction on November 29, 2022.</p>
--

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)	
Julia Kim	
Signature: 	Date: January 8, 2026

Name: (Department Head)	
ANTHONY C. MARRONE	
Signature: 	Date: 1-8-26

<p>Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY</p> <p>Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.</p>

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Betty Karmirlian	
Signature: <i>Betty Karmirlian</i>	Date: 1/8/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Lila C. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	24-cv-02825-ODW-MAA
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	July 17, 2027
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 99,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	SHAWN MCMILLAN, ESQ. Law Offices of Shawn McMillan
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	ARMITA RADJABIAN Senior Deputy County Counsel Social Services Division JENNIFER GYSLER, ESQ. Monroy, Averbuck and Gysler
NATURE OF CASE	Plaintiff alleges civil rights violations when she was removed from her mother's care and abused in foster care. Due to the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs and a potential adverse verdict. The full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$99,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 26,580
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Marlen Medina v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-CV-05277-AH-MAA
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	June 21, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County Probation Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 2,500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	DAVID S. McLANE LINDSAY BATTLES LAURA F. DONALDSON McLane, Bednarski & Litt, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	ANNA R. REITANO Deputy County Counsel Justice and Safety Division ANDREW BAUM Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan & Shapiro LLP
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Marlen Medina arising from the overdose death of Bryan Diaz while in custody at the Los Angeles County Probation Department's Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall on May 9, 2023, for a \$2,500,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs.</p> <p>Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, this settlement is considered reasonable and will avoid further litigation expenses. Approval of the full and final settlement in the amount of \$2,500,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 90,231
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 20,190



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 9, 2023
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Plaintiff alleged the Department was negligent and failed to protect and prevent youth in our care from the use of deadly narcotics, such as fentanyl. Plaintiff also alleged the Department was severely understaffed and officers were poorly trained.</p> <p>On May 9, 2023, a youth adult (18 years old) was found deceased at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall in his living unit. The Department of Health Services' Nursing staff responded and immediately administered emergency services, including the use of Narcan. To no avail, all life-saving attempts were unsuccessful.</p> <p>During the administrative review, it was discovered that the mandatory safety checks had not been conducted as required. Additionally, there was inadequate supervision due to critical staffing issues.</p>

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

- A. Lack of training on use of Narcan/ insufficient number of staff issued Narcan and
- B. Insufficient measures to prevent Narcotics from entering the facility
- C. Lack of conducting routine safety checks in compliance with Departmental policy
- D. Windows covered – sight of view blocked.

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

- A. The department-initiated training in December 2022. Narcan training was on-going when this event occurred. The department continued with training as planned and all Deputized staff were trained to administer Narcan. Two doses of Narcan and two holsters are issued to staff after the completion of training. All Narcan will be replaced upon its expiration date.
- B. A clear bag policy was implemented on May 9, 2023, which requires that all personal property bags and containers brought into juvenile institutions, whether by sworn or non-sworn department employees, must be constructed of a clear material. A maximum of one clear backpack and one clear bag or lunch box will be allowed per staff member.
- C. In September 2023, an airport grade baggage scanner was installed at the facility. The scanner provides an enhanced screening of belongings and packages for a multi-layered approach to security coverage. The baggage scanner utilizes dual-energy x-ray transmission technology to identify organic, inorganic, metallic substances/materials that may be concealed inside bags such as drugs, weapons, and unauthorized electronics. This technology is Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved for safe screening of food items.
- D. On August 19, 2025, a millimeter wave body scanner, which uses radio-frequency energy to scan the surface of a person's body, was installed at the facility. This body scanner can detect any metallic or non-metallic objects such as plastics, powders, liquids, and organic material concealed on the body/clothing or in the natural body contours (e.g., between buttocks, under breasts, or in armpits) of a person, and suspected areas are then highlighted on a monitor with an avatar of the person. The security personnel will then be able to request the person place the items through the baggage scanner and re-enter the body scanner until they are cleared.
- E. Supervisors are required to conduct a daily safety check audit of missed/late safety check reports by unit and shift to ensure that safety checks are conducted in accordance with Title 15 and policy that was published April 3, 2023, and is still in effect.
- F. The Department conducted an internal investigation, and it was determined that safety checks were not conducted as required by policy. As a result, disciplinary action was imposed.
- G. Youth are orientated to the Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) rules and regulations of the facility, which include instructions for youth not to cover windows. If a youth's window is covered, staff immediately remove or instruct youth to remove obstruction. If youth are found to be covering windows, the Department utilizes a behavior management program known as Developmental Stage System (DSS), which deducts points for negative behaviors, including covering windows or graffiti. The points are used as rewards for canteen and stage promotions

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: <i>Crystal Hurtado</i>	Date: 1/21/2026

Name: (Department Head) Stacy Lopez-Maddox	
Signature: <i>Stacy Lopez-Maddox</i>	Date: 1/21/2026

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.

Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Betty Karmirian	
Signature: <i>Betty Karmirian</i>	Date: 1/22/26

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		PACE Tax Claim of Galavis
CASE NUMBER		N/A PACE Tax Claim
COURT		N/A
DATE FILED		5/12/2025
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Internal Services Department (ISD)
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$	Galavis up to \$52,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		N/A
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Michael Owens
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to pay a tax claim brought by a property owner impacted by fraudulent behavior of home improvement contractors under the County's PACE program. County alleges PACE claimant improperly used PACE financing for an ADU conversion and Claimant alleges the home improvement contractor did not complete the work.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$	0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$	0

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Daniel Saldana v. Martha Donovan, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-CV-00895
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	August 31, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 3,700,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	NICK BRUSTIN, AMELIA GREEN, RHIANNA REY, & ANNIE SLOAN Neufeld, Scheck, Brustin, Hoffmann, & Freudenberger LLP MICHAEL ROMANO & SUSAN CHAMPION Stanford Law School
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MICHAEL G. FREEDMAN & ASHWINI MATE The Freedman Firm PC ADAM SEXTON Deputy County Counsel Justice and Safety Division
NATURE OF CASE	ANDREW BAUM Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan & Shapiro LLP <p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$3,700,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit pursuant to Title 42 of the United States Code section 1982 brought by Daniel Saldana ("Plaintiff") against the County of Los Angeles ("County") and former Deputy District Attorney Steven Sowders ("DDA Sowders") (and, collectively, the "County Defendants") for a wrongful conviction. Plaintiff's suit also includes state law claims of negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, intentional interference with a prisoner's right to obtain judicial review of confinement, and vicarious liability.</p> <p>Thus, based on all the foregoing, we believe the proposed settlement is reasonable, and will avoid further litigation costs and a potential adverse verdict which, along with any attorneys' fees award, could well exceed the recommended settlement amount.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 163,802
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 10,240



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 1989 to 2017
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>On June 6, 2017, Plaintiff appeared before the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Board of Parole Hearings (“BPH” or “Board”) for the first time. The presiding commissioner at the hearing was a member of the Board who is named as a defendant in this case. Plaintiff maintained his innocence during the proceeding and was ultimately denied parole based on a finding of unsuitability. Records obtained during the investigative and discovery process indicate that one of the factors influencing the denial was the commissioner’s assessment that Plaintiff lacked insight and failed to accept responsibility for the underlying offense.</p> <p>Approximately two months later, on August 31, 2017, Plaintiff’s trial co-defendant appeared before the Board, with the same commissioner presiding over that hearing. A representative from the LA District Attorney’s office participated in the proceeding. During the hearing, the co-defendant admitted to involvement in the 1989 shooting and, for the first time, stated that Plaintiff was not involved. The co-defendant identified a different individual as the third participant in the incident.</p> <p>The LA District Attorney’s employee shared the new information with a coworker and his supervisor; however, nobody shared the information with the Conviction Integrity Unit.</p> <p>In 2023, upon receiving notice from the BPH, the District Attorney’s Office initiated a reinvestigation of Plaintiff’s convictions. The reinvestigation found corroboration for the co-defendant’s 2017 testimony and concluded that Plaintiff had no involvement in the 1989 crime.</p>

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

Failure of department personnel to notify the Conviction Integrity Unit of potential Brady material discovered during a parole hearing.

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

A) Failure of departmental personnel to notify the Conviction Integrity Unit of potential Brady material discovered during a parole hearing.

Ensure all new Deputy District Attorneys (DDAs) receive comprehensive training on their legal and ethical obligations regarding Brady material. This training will highlight the identification of potential Brady disclosures during post-conviction proceedings, including parole hearings. It will emphasize strict compliance with Special Directive 16-04 (Conviction Review Unit/ Requirement and Reporting) and be delivered through annual in-service sessions and reinforced by an annual memorandum distributed to all staff.


The department has completed its investigation into the failure to forward information to the Conviction Integrity Unit (CIU). Both the Head Deputy and Assistant Head Deputy of the Parole Division from 2017 have since retired. The investigation found that, following the parole hearing, the handling District Attorney prepared the required Parole Board Hearing Memorandum detailing the claim of innocence. Under Special Directive 16-04, the CRU is responsible for reviewing qualifying post-conviction claims of innocence. The findings confirm that a prompt notification to the CIU was required but did not occur. To prevent similar issues, the department will address this in the training outlined above. Responsibility shall rest with both the District Attorney assigned to the post-conviction matter and the division supervisors.

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) Julie Dixon Silva, Director	
Signature: 	Date: 01/14/2026

Name: (Department Head) Steven Katz, Chief Deputy	
Signature: 	Date: 01/14/2026

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General) Betty Karmirian	
Signature: 	Date: 1/15/26

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 2, 2026

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:44 a.m. The meeting was held virtually with Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro, Claims Board Member Oscar Valdez, Claims Board Member Adrienne M. Byers, and Claims Board Administrator Laura Z. Salazar 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 N. Corry, Kevin Engeliem, Nena Vuong, Lauren Dods, Liliana Campos, Warren Wellen, Michael Simon, Stacey Lee, Andria Seo, Katherine Bowser, Victoria Jalili, Christopher Keosian, Jonathan McCaverty, Donna Koch, and Jenny Park appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Robb Myrtle appeared for the Department of Health Services. Kevin Lee appeared for the Department of Public Health. Daniel Benitez, Leslie Luke, and Arthur Young appeared for the Chief Executive Office. Brian Mejia, Doris Rodriguez, and Marisol Gonzalez appeared for the Department of Parks and Recreation. Hank Fung, Lance Grindle, Jolene Guerrero, and Patricia Chan appeared for the Department of Public Works. Christina Lee and Veronica Pawlowski appeared for the Department of Children and Family Services. Captain Chris M. Kusayanagi, Sergeant Jennifer Romero, Captain Shawnee Hinchman, Deputy Nancy K. Madarasz, Commander Terrence Bell, Lieutenant Jennifer M. Roth, and Chief Yolanda Figueroa appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Monnica L. Thelen appeared for the Office of the Public Defender. Nichelle Shaw appeared for the Department of Medical Examiner. Roy Garcia appeared for Hurrell Cantrall, LLP. Nicole Gordon appeared for Meyers Nave. Patrick J. Richard appeared for Nossaman LLP. Vince McGowan and Ani Barsamian appeared for Hausman & Sosa, LLP. Avi Burkwitz appeared for Peterson Bradford Burkwitz Gregorio Burkwitz & Su, LLP. Nohemi Gutierrez Ferguson appeared for Gutierrez, Preciado, & House LLP. Jason H. Tokoro appeared for Miller & Barondess, LLP. Armineh Megrabyan appeared for Kessel & Megrabyan.

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 (Government Code section 54956.9, subdivision (a)).

At 9:45 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(m).

4. Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

On the public teleconference phone line, an unidentified caller was present to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 1:41 p.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. **Kalante Kiko Holmes, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23CMCV01450

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiffs allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Health Services employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(a) in the amount of \$29,000.

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

b. **Julie Jaleh Sabaierad v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV00997

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Public Health employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(b) in the amount of \$125,000.

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

c. **Alexxa Cardoza, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24PSCV00583

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiffs allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving an employee of the Chief Executive Office.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(c) in the amount of \$85,000.

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

d. **Maria Escobedo Preciado, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24CHCV02751

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiffs allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Parks and Recreation employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(d) in the amount of \$38,000.

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

e. **Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 25STCP00169

This writ action alleges that the Department of Public Works failed to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(e) in the amount of \$97,500.

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

f. **Monique Alvarez, et al. v. Prologis, Inc., et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV38929

This lawsuit alleges that Plaintiffs suffered personal injuries and property damage as a result of toxic chemicals and noxious odors from the Dominguez Channel.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(f) in the amount of \$6,000,000.

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

g. **Sholeh Ansari v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV28816

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

Action Taken:

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

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

h. **The Estate of "CMW", et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-00889

This wrongful death lawsuit against the Department of Children and Family Services arises out of the death of a two-month-old while in foster care.

Action Taken:

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

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

i. **George De La O v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24PSCV02573

This lawsuit involves allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to sexual harassment, discrimination, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(i) in the amount of \$35,000.

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

j. **Robert Francis Coyle v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV27463

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Sheriff's Department was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(j) in the amount of \$260,000.

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

k. **Art Hernandez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV33158

This lawsuit claims that current and former deputies from the Sheriff's Department were harassed and discriminated against by other former deputies who were allegedly members of the Banditos gang.

Action Taken:

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

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

l. **Judith Greenberg v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV11452

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Public Defender's Office was subjected to discrimination based on a disability.

Action Taken:

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

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

**m. David Smith v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV35717**

This lawsuit alleges that the Department of Medical Examiner failed to engage in the interactive process and failed to accommodate an employee with a disability.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(m) in the amount of \$675,000.

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

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

Action Taken:


The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the January 5, 2026, meeting.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Destiny Castro and Oscar Valdez
Abstention: Adrienne M. Byers

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:42 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By 
Laura Z. Salazar
Claims Board Administrator
Office of the County Counsel