



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CLAIMS BOARD
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Arlene Barrera
Auditor-Controller
Steve Robles
Chief Executive Office
Steven H. Estabrook
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, March 4, 2019 at 9:30 a.m.**, in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

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 (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).
 - a. Claims of Levon A. Gukasyan, Levon Haik Gukasyan, Anthony Gevorkan, and Progressive Select Insurance ASO Armen Gukasyan

These claims arise from damages and injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Board of Supervisors; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$36,939.03.

See Supporting Document

- b. Zinash Kassa v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 633 484

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Board of Supervisors and a pedestrian; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$29,999.

See Supporting Document

- c. Margaret Gacquindo, et al. v. Los Angeles County Department of Animal Care and Control.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. MC 027 098

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from an alleged trip and fall at the Lancaster Animal Shelter; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$99,999.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- d. Roney Coffman v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 653 479

This lawsuit arises from damages and injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Sergeant; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$95,000

[See Supporting Document](#)

- e. Tammy Cameron v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:15-CV-00774

This lawsuit alleges Plaintiff was falsely arrested based on a warrant for someone else and subsequently prosecuted for a crime she did not commit; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$75,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- f. Dolores Perez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:17-CV-01630

This lawsuit alleges federal civil rights violations, and wrongful death arising from the fatal shooting of Plaintiff's son; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$600,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- g. Samuel Caldwell, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:18-CV-6906

This lawsuit alleges deliberate indifference to the medical needs on an inmate while in the custody of the Sheriff's Department and also while he was a patient at one of the facilities operated by the Department of Health Services; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$250,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

h. Claim of Adam Martinez

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was wrongfully terminated; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

i. Christine Mejia v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 653 194

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Probation Department was subjected to harassment based on sexual orientation and that the Department failed to prevent the harassment; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$40,000.

j. Sharese Mizakhanyan v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 664 424

This lawsuit concerns allegations by an employee from the Department of Public Services of disability discrimination, retaliation, and failure to make a reasonable accommodation and to engage in the interactive process; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$130,000.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

5. Approval of the minutes of the February 4, 2019, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

See Supporting Document

6. Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

7. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Claims of Levon A. Gukasyan, Levon Haik Gukasyan, Anthony Gevorkian, and Progressive Select Insurance ASO Armen Gukasyan
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Board of Supervisors
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 36,939.03
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Ruben Vardanyan, Vardanyan Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Kelsey Nau
NATURE OF CASE	<p>On August 2, 2017, Plaintiffs Levon A. Gukaysan, Levon Haik Gukasyan, and Anthony Gevorkian were driving a vehicle owned by Armen Gukasyan when they were involved in a motor vehicle collision with a County employee claiming injuries and damages.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Zinash Kassa v. County of Los Angeles, et. al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 633484
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	September 20, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Board of Supervisors
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 29,999
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Omid Khorshidi, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Adrian G. Gragas Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from a vehicle versus pedestrian collision that occurred on January 26, 2016, when a Los Angeles County vehicle driven by Board of Supervisors employee failed to yield the right of way of Plaintiff Zinash Kassa and struck her on her right-leg. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 56,454
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 22,292

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Margaret Gacquindo, et a. v. Los Angeles County Department of Animal Care and Control
CASE NUMBER	MC 027098
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	April 25, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Animal Care and Control
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 99,999
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Kyle Madison Madison Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jessica C. Rivas Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This lawsuit arises from an August 16, 2016, trip and fall incident at Antelope Valley Animal Shelter. Ms. Gacquindo claims to have suffered injuries as a result. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 23,607
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 4,090

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Roney Coffman v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC653479
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 3, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 95,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Armando J. Berriz Neustadt & Berriz, A Professional Corporation
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Richard K. Kudo Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This case involves a vehicle collision that occurred on October 5, 2016, when a Sheriff's Department ("LASD") Ford Crown Victoria patrol vehicle rolling Code 3 driven by a LASD Sgt. collided with the GMC Sonoma pickup truck driven by Plaintiff Roney Coffman at the intersection of Gage Avenue and Hooper Avenue in the unincorporated part of the County near South Los Angeles. Plaintiff claims to have suffered injuries and damages from the accident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 47,757
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 17,903

CASE SUMMARY


INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Tammy Cameron v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:15-CV-00774
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	February 3, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 75,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Christopher L. Driscoll, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Richard Hsueh, Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$75,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Tammy Cameron alleging the County and a Sheriff's Detective violated her civil rights by causing the issuance of a false arrest warrant for a robbery she did not commit.</p> <p>Given the high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. The full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$75,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 240,474
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 57,430

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Dolores Perez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:17-CV-01630
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	March 1, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 600,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Dale K. Galipo, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon, Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$600,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights and wrongful death lawsuit filed by decedent Joshua Quintero's parents after their son was fatally shot by a Sheriff's Department Deputy.</p> <p>The Deputy denies the allegations and contends his actions were reasonable.</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 \$600,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 168,646
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 23,469



Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary for attachment to the settlement documents developed for the Board of Supervisors and/or the County of Los Angeles Claims Board. The summary should be a specific overview of the claims/lawsuits' identified root causes and corrective actions (status, time frame, and responsible party). This summary does not replace the Corrective Action Plan form. If there is a question related to confidentiality, please consult County Counsel.

Date of incident/event:	
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p><u>Dolores Perez & Sergio Quintero v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u> Summary Corrective Action Plan 2018-032</p> <p>On September 1, 2016, at approximately 5:47 p.m., deputy sheriffs responded to the area of 83rd Street and Beach Street, in unincorporated Los Angeles, in response to two different residents calling Century Station to report a man walking around the neighborhood bleeding from an apparent gunshot wound.</p> <p>Within one minute of receiving the call for service, the first and second deputy sheriffs (radio car partners) arrived on scene and discovered a gunshot victim walking on Beach Street, South of 84th Street. The gunshot victim was under the influence of a dangerous narcotic and uncooperative with investigative questions. Within two minutes, the third and fourth deputy sheriffs (radio car partners) arrived on scene. The first deputy sheriff believed the shooting suspect may still be in the area and asked the third and fourth deputy sheriffs to canvass the area for witnesses and suspects.</p> <p>The third and fourth deputy sheriffs had only driven their marked patrol vehicle a short distance away when they found the decedent and two other men walking together. From their attire and tattoos, it appeared the decedent and the two men were possible gang members. Upon initial contact, the decedent and the two men seemed nervous when asked about the shooting. The third (driver) and fourth (passenger) deputy sheriffs stopped and exited their patrol vehicle as they further questioned the decedent and the two other men to determine if they had any knowledge of the shooting or any persons involved.</p> <p>During the questioning, the decedent slowly began to walk away, disassociating himself from the group, and then suddenly sprinted northbound on Beach Street. Under the belief the decedent may be the shooting suspect and could still possibly be armed, the third deputy sheriff drew his service weapon and held it in his hand as he chased after the decedent and repeatedly yelled for him to stop.</p> <p>Although he saw his partner chase after the decedent, the fourth deputy sheriff believed the two other men with the decedent may also be involved in the shooting. The fourth deputy sheriff remained with the two men but called out to the other nearby deputy sheriffs still investigating the incident with the gunshot victim.</p> <p>The fourth deputy sheriff yelled out that the third deputy sheriff was involved in a foot pursuit and requested the nearby partners provide some assistance. The first deputy sheriff heard the fourth deputy sheriff's</p>

	<p>request, saw the third deputy sheriff chasing the decedent, and joined in the foot pursuit.</p> <p>The third deputy sheriff closely followed the decedent (from approximately 15 feet away) as he ran northwest across Beach Street and entered a no-outlet alley. As the decedent ran into the alley, he used his hands to reach into his waistband. Fearing the decedent was involved in the recent shooting and could have a firearm, the third deputy sheriff ordered the decedent not to reach for his waistband or he would have to shoot him. The third deputy sheriff did not see the decedent holding a gun at this time.</p> <p>From the first deputy sheriff's perspective, he saw the decedent was running with a gun in his hand. The first deputy sheriff used his handheld radio to broadcast they were in foot pursuit of a man with a gun.</p> <p>Note: During the foot pursuit, the first deputy sheriff and several civilian witnesses saw the decedent running with a gun in his hand.</p> <p>As the decedent continued running in the alley, he made a turn into a fenced parking area. The third deputy sheriff saw the decedent raise his hand that was holding a firearm. This was the first time the third deputy sheriff had seen the decedent holding a firearm.</p> <p>Although the decedent was facing away from him, the third deputy sheriff feared the decedent was turning and about to shoot him. The third deputy sheriff fired his service weapon three times at the decedent, from about 10-15 feet away. Simultaneously, the decedent quickly lifted his arm up and flung the firearm into the air and over a nearby fence into the neighboring backyard. Two of the rounds fired by the third deputy sheriff struck the decedent in the back of his head and on his right heel. The decedent collapsed and fell forward to the ground.</p> <p>Note: About 30 seconds elapsed from the time the decedent ran away, until the deputy involved shooting occurred.</p> <p>Emergency medical personnel had just arrived on-scene for the original gunshot victim and responded to the decedent's location. Lifesaving efforts were conducted and the decedent was transported to Saint Francis Medical Center, where he succumb to his injuries and was pronounced dead.</p> <p>The firearm, a .38 caliber handgun discarded by the decedent, was recovered from an adjoining property where it landed.</p>
--	--

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was a deputy sheriff fired his weapon at the decedent, who was facing away and retrieving a handgun from his waistband at the time he was shot.

A **non-Department** root cause was the decedent's failure to comply with the deputy sheriff's lawful orders and by the decedent's quick hand and arm motions with a firearm, which was perceived as an impending attack against the pursuing deputy sheriff.

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

The incident was investigated by the Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau and the facts of this case were presented to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

On June 28, 2018, the District Attorney's Office completed its review of the fatal shooting of the decedent by the deputy, and concluded the deputy acted lawfully, and in self-defense.

The Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) will investigate this incident to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The California Government Code's Peace Officer Bill of Rights sets guidelines for administrative investigation statute dates.

When the IAB investigator finishes the case, it will be reviewed and processed. Approximately one month after the case has been approved, the case will be presented to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication.

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

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)

Scott E. Johnson, Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:



Date:

12-28-18

Name (Department Head)

Matthew J. Burson, A/Chief
Professional Standards and Training Division

Signature:



Date:

01-01-19

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)

Signature:



Date:



CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Samuel Caldwell, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:18-6906 PSG (MRWx)
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	7/6/2018
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Department of Health Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 250,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Marc Geragos Geragos & Geragos
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Caroline S. Craddock Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>On September 23, 2017, Octavious Caldwell ("Mr. Caldwell") was arrested. Mr. Caldwell was diabetic and given insulin. On September 27, 2017, Mr. Caldwell suffered a seizure and died.</p> <p>Mr. Caldwell's parents, Samuel Caldwell and Tameca Spriggs, filed a lawsuit against the County of Los Angeles alleging deliberate indifference and failure to treat, monitor, and manage their son's diabetic attack.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 4,750
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 4,006

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

February 4, 2019

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:32 a.m. The meeting was held in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

Claims Board Members present at the meeting were: Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Michael Gordon, Richard Kudo, Millicent Rolon, Richard Hsueh, Adrian Gragas, Katherine Bowser, Donna Koch, and Caroline Craddock; Department of Public Works: Dominic Osmena; Sheriff's Department: Kerry Carter, April Tardy, Kevin Percy, Reginald Louie, Jeff Scroggin, David Flores, Justin Diez, and Christopher Reed; District Attorney: Julie Dixon Silva; Fire Department: Anthony Marrone, Stephen Freeman, and Julia Bennett; Department of Children and Family Services: Karla Hernandez; Probation Department: Chereise Simmons; Department of Health Services: Arun Patel and Ellen Rothman; Outside Counsel: Avi Burkwitz.

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

No members of the public addressed the Claims Board.

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

At 9:34 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(j) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 11:41 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

a. Barbara Sheldon, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 608 441

This lawsuit arises from damages and injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Department of Public Works.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$95,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

b. **Jose Estrada v. Christopher Muse, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 648 179

This lawsuit arises from damages and injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$62,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

c. **Kent Oda, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 657 355

This lawsuit arises from injuries allegedly sustained by Plaintiffs in a home invasion robbery allegedly due to a Sheriff's Deputy mishandling the 911 call.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$800,000.

Vote: Ayes: 2 – Arlene Barrera and Steven Estabrook
Abstention: 1 - Steve Robles

d. **Vanessa Bowers, et al. v. County of Los Angeles**
United States District Court Case No. CV 17-08088

C.M., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 17-05135

These consolidated wrongful death lawsuits concern allegations of negligence by a Sheriff's Deputy arising from a shooting.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$4,600,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

e. **Robert Chacon v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 634 227

This lawsuit arises from injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the District Attorney's Office.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$30,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

f. **Mayra Judith Romero v. Daniel Emile Rodriguez, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 685 203

This lawsuit arises from injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Fire Department.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$256,500.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

g. **Amber Fimbres, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:18-CV-03931

This lawsuit alleges Plaintiffs' civil rights were violated when the Department of Children and Family Services allegedly detained their two minor children without a warrant.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$775,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

**h. Genevieve Barron v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 601 353**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Probation Department was subjected to sexual harassment, and that the Department failed to prevent the sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$75,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

**i. Florinda Rojas Reyes, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 658 271**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of medical malpractice when Plaintiff received care and treatment at Martin Luther King, Jr. Multi-Services Ambulatory Care Center.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$425,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

**j. Krystyna Helena Kubran v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 621 027**

This lawsuit arises from injuries allegedly sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Department of Animal Care and Control.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$45,000. (Continued from the Claims Board Meeting of January 7, 2019.)

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook

5. **Approval of the minutes of the January 7, 2019, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Steven Estabrook


6. **Items not on the posted agenda, to be referred to staff or placed on the agenda for action at a further meeting of the Board, or matters requiring immediate action because of emergency situation or where the need to take immediate action came to the attention of the Board subsequent to the posting of the agenda.**

No such matters were discussed.

7. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By 
Sandra C. Ruiz