**STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD**

**HELD IN ROOM 739 OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION,**

**500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012**

**ON MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.**

**Present: Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers.**

**1. Call to Order.**

**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).**

**a. Non-litigated Claim of Martha and Alexander Rague**
**Claim No. 19-1150819*003**

This inverse condemnation claim seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works for property damage caused by a sewage backflow.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $33,709.80.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

See Supporting Document

**b. Non-litigated Claim of Ramon and Gloria Rodriguez**

This inverse condemnation claim seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works for property damage caused by a sewage backflow.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $62,506.49.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

See Supporting Document

c. **Mario Garcia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**United States District Court Case No. 13-CV-00616**

This lawsuit alleges federal and State-law civil rights violations by the Sheriff's Department.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $150,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

See Supporting Documents

d. **Dennis Todd Rodgers, Jr., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**United States District Court Case. No. 17-CV-05236**

This lawsuit alleges federal civil rights violations and wrongful death arising out of the fatal Deputy-involved shooting of Plaintiff's father.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $1,300,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

See Supporting Documents

e. **Anquonette Barlow v. County of Los Angeles**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 676 556**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Office of the Assessor was subjected to retaliation, harassment, and discrimination based on race and gender.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $380,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

**4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.**

The Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as indicated under Agenda Item No. 3 above.

**5. Approval of the Minutes of the March 2, 2020, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

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.**

No such matters were discussed.

**7. Adjournment.**

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Non-litigated Claim of Rague, Martha & Alexander |
| CASE NUMBER | | N/A |
| COURT | | N/A |
| DATE FILED | | May 1, 2019 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Department of Public Works |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 33,709.80 (sum includes remediation prepayment of $14,324.69) |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | N/A |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Joseph A. Langton<br>Principal Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This claim arises from a blocked sewer mainline that caused a sewage backflow that damaged Claimants' real property.<br><br>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full settlement of the claim 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 Claim of Ramon Rodriguez and Gloria Rodriguez |
| CASE NUMBER | | N/A |
| COURT | | N/A |
| DATE FILED | | June 22, 2018 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Department of Public Works |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | $62,506.49<br>(sum includes prior payment of $38,387.61) |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | N/A |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Lindsay Yoshiyama<br>Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This claim arises from a blocked sewer mainline that caused a sewage backflow into Claimants' residence and damaged their real property. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full settlement of the claim is warranted. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 0 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 38,387.61 |

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Mario Garcia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al. |
| CASE NUMBER | | 13-CV-00616 |
| COURT | | United States District Court |
| DATE FILED | | April 5, 2013 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Sheriff's Department |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 150,000 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | Don Cook, Esq. |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Richard Hsueh<br>Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This is a recommendation to settle for $150,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Mario A. Garcia against Los Angeles County and former Sheriff Leroy Baca in connection with his arrest and detention on a warrant allegedly for another person.<br><br>Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $150,000 is recommended. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 712,489 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 43,251 |

| Case Name: | Garcia, Mario Alberto V. County of Los Angeles | |
|---|---|---|

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

# 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: | • An inmate was arrested by the City of Banning Police Department on suspicion of driving while intoxicated on November 26, 2012. He was transferred to the custody of the County of Riverside for booking. During the booking process the arrestee matched to an outstanding Los Angeles County felony bench warrant.<br>• While in custody of Riverside County, the inmate was provided the opportunity to appear before a judge to protest the mistaken identity. However, the arrestee declined in writing to appear before a Riverside magistrate.<br>• On November 27, 2012, the arrestee was transferred to the custody of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD). During his time in custody, there was no record to indicate the inmate ever complained to LASD staff that he was not the subject of the warrant. On the morning of November 29, 2012, the arrestee was released from court after the court determined the inmate being held on the warrant was the wrong person. |

| Case Name: | Garcia, Mario Alberto V. County of Los Angeles | |
|---|---|---|

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

The primary **Department** root cause in this incident was the lack of a proactive procedure that established verification of identity during the booking of warrant arrests, and the handling of disputed warrants.

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

**Warrant Arrest Verification Procedure**

- **Corrective Action:**

As a result of this incident the Department established a Custody Directive 18-007 (Warrant Arrest Verification Procedures), which established a verification procedure to be used during the booking process of warrant arrests, and the handling of disputed warrants. As part of this new procedure, a "Warrant Verification Stamp" will be placed on Warrant Information Sheets and the booking deputy/officer will ensure the arrestee does not dispute they are the person identified on the warrant.

If the arrestee claims they are not the person identified in the warrant, then the watch commander shall be notified and a comparison of identifying information (fingerprint comparison, past criminal history, and other law enforcement records) will be used to decide if the arrestee shall continue to be held on the warrant. If it is determined the arrestee is not the subject wanted in the warrant, the jailer shall release the individual from the warrant hold under 849 (b)(1) PC.

Responsible person: Assistant Sheriff Robert Olmsted

| Case Name: | Garcia, Mario Alberto V. County of Los Angeles | |
|---|---|---|

County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)<br>Commander Cheryl Newman-Tarwater | |
| Signature: | Date: 10-8-19 |
| Name: (Department Head)<br>Chief Bruce D. Chase | |
| Signature: | Date: 10-8-19 |

**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)<br>CEO Destiny Castro | |
| Signature: Destiny Castro | Date: 10-9-2019 |

## CASE SUMMARY

## INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| CASE NAME | | Rogers, Dennis Todd v. County of Los Angeles, et al. |
| CASE NUMBER | | 2:17-CV-05236 |
| COURT | | United States District Court |
| DATE FILED | | July 14, 2017 |
| COUNTY DEPARTMENT | | Sheriff's Department |
| PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT | $ | 1,300,000 |
| ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF | | Peter L. Carr, IV, Esq. |
| COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY | | Millicent L. Rolon, Principal Deputy County Counsel |
| NATURE OF CASE | | This is a recommendation to settle for $1,300,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a wrongful death and federal civil rights lawsuit filed against the County and Sheriff's Department Deputies by decedent Dennis Todd Rogers' adult child, Dennis Todd Rogers Jr., and minor children, D. A. R. and D. J. R., by and through their Guardian ad Litem, after the fatal shooting of Dennis Todd Rogers by a Deputy.<br><br>The Deputies deny the allegations and contend their actions were reasonable.<br><br>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 $1,300,000 is recommended. |
| PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE | $ | 66,102 |
| PAID COSTS, TO DATE | $ | 3,785 |

Case Name: Dennis Rogers v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

# Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of incident/event: | March 7, 2017 |
| Briefly provide a description of the incident/event: | **Dennis Rogers v. County of Los Angeles**<br>Summary Corrective Action Plan 2019-042<br><br>On Tuesday, March 7, 2017, at approximately 8:40 p.m., an employee at the "24 Hour Fitness gym" (gym) called Marina Del Rey Station and reported a male patron wearing a white t shirt, jeans and multi colored tennis shoes (decedent) had been in the gym all day for the past four days, was currently creating a disturbance, and he was refusing to leave.<br><br>At approximately 9:00 p.m., two uniformed deputy sheriffs working a marked two-man patrol unit responded to the location regarding the disturbance call. Upon arrival, the deputy sheriffs spoke with the business manager and security guard. They were advised the decedent had only been a member of the gym for 4 days, but he had not left the location for the past 72 hours. The decedent had not changed out of his street clothing and did not workout. The decedent wandered around the gym and exhibited "weird" behavior by getting very close to other gym members and saying strange things to them. The decedent also challenged another male patron to a fight. Several gym members complained to the manager about the decedent making them feel uncomfortable.<br><br>The deputy sheriffs contacted the decedent who was sitting on an exercise bicycle and asked him to step outside. The decedent complied but became agitated as he moved through the business. The decedent proceeded to the men's locker room and retrieved a backpack from a locker. While exiting the gym, the decedent told the deputy sheriffs they were "fake cops" and that the "FBI and CIA were watching him."<br><br>In the deputy sheriffs presence, the manager verbally revoked the decedent's gym membership for the day and warned him not to go back inside. The decedent walked around in the parking lot then sat on the steps in front of the gym's main glass door and made non-threatening comments to other gym patrons as they came and went from the gym. At that time, the deputy sheriffs determined the decedent could care for himself and he was not a danger to himself and/or others. At 10:00 p.m., believing the situation had been resolved, the deputy sheriffs left the location and returned to Marina Del Rey Station for the end of their shift.<br><br>After the deputy sheriffs left, the decedent remained outside the gym. After some time, the manager ended his shift and was about to leave the location when he noticed the decedent was outside the front glass doors of the gym and he appeared to be angry. When the decedent saw the manager through the glass, he reached into his backpack and yelled to the manager by name stating, "Come outside! I'm going to get you! I'm |

| | |
|---|---|
| | going to get you! I've been waiting on you!" The manager feared for his safety, believed the decedent may be reaching for a weapon, and did not want to walk to his car by himself. The armed security officer at the location, was also concerned about escorting the manager to his car because he feared the decedent's actions might force him to draw his weapon on the decedent.<br><br>At approximately 10:40 p.m., the gym manager called Marina Del Rey Station for the second time to report the decedent had not left the location, was creating a disturbance, and was outside yelling at customers. Two separate two-man patrol units responded to the location, regarding the second disturbance call. While responding to the location, the deputy sheriffs formulated a tactical plan identifying who would be responsible for contact and who would have a Taser on standby.<br><br>The deputy sheriffs contacted the decedent in front of the location and asked him why he was upset. The decedent said either the manager or the security officer had hit him on the head. The decedent advised the deputy sheriffs that when the security guard or the manager exited the business he was going to, "fuck them up!" The decedent then yelled at the deputies, stating they worked for the "FBI."<br><br>Seeing the decedent was irate and believing he was possibly in a mental health crisis, the deputy sheriffs requested a field supervisor and a Mental Evaluation Team (MET) to their location. They soon learned that MET team personnel were unavailable to respond at that time, as they were handling another mental health incident.<br><br>The decedent continued pacing back and forth in front of the location while carrying his backpack. The decedent called the deputy sheriffs "fake cops," and continued to yell at and harass patrons as they entered and exited the gym. Most of the decedent's anger appeared to be directed at the manager, who was inside the glass doors of the gym. The decedent moved toward the glass front doors and yelled, "I'm gonna fuck you up!"<br><br>The decedent also expressed general and specific anger at the deputy sheriffs and other business patrons as well. At some point, the decedent approached the first deputy sheriff, came within inches of his person, and told him, "Don't fuck'n touch me, I'll fuck you up, I'll kill you."<br><br>The second deputy sheriff walked up to the gym in an attempt to contact the manager. The decedent charged toward the second deputy sheriff in an aggressive manner yelling, "You wanna fight! I'll fuck you up too." The decedent's actions caused the second deputy to fear for his safety so he moved back, away from the decedent and the business. The decedent continued to aggressively approach the second deputy sheriff, as he retreated.<br><br>Identifying the decedent's behavior as a high risk/assaultive, and in fear for the second deputy sheriff's safety and the safety of the public, the first deputy yelled, "Taser" and deployed his Taser device at the decedent. The Taser darts hit the decedent in the chest area, but it appeared to be ineffective. The decedent ripped the darts off his body, threw them on the ground, and said, "Oh, you gonna Taser me? Is that all you got?" The decedent then walked away from the deputy sheriffs, while carrying his backpack. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | The first deputy sheriff quickly retrieved another Taser from his patrol car and handed it to the second deputy sheriff.<br><br>Fearing the decedent was now a threat to the public, the deputy sheriffs gave the decedent several orders to stop, but the decedent did not comply. The deputy sheriffs followed the decedent on foot as he walked through a walkway between two buildings and headed toward West Slauson Avenue. The decedent entered an empty parking lot, at 5035 West Slauson Avenue, that was near a heavily traveled public roadway.<br><br>While walking, the decedent told the deputies that he "had something for them." While in the parking lot, the decedent attempted to walk away then turned around and focused his attention towards the deputy sheriffs. The decedent began aggressively walking toward all the deputy sheriffs. The deputy sheriffs retreated away from the decedent, in an attempt to maintain a safe distance from him. The decedent's erratic and aggressive behavior and movement made it difficult for the deputy sheriffs to contain him.<br><br>The decedent quickly stopped, put his backpack on the ground, and reached into his backpack. Believing the decedent was retrieving a weapon, the deputy sheriffs yelled, "Let me see your hands!"<br><br>The decedent removed an object from his backpack with a long cord attached to it (later identified as a pair of electric hair clippers [clippers]). The decedent then yelled, "I'm gonna fuck you guys up! I'm gonna kill one of you!" The decedent wrapped the end of the cord around his right hand then, with the clippers at the other end of the cord, he swung the clippers around in a circle over his head and in a crisscross pattern in front of him while aggressively advancing towards the deputy sheriffs.<br><br>Note: At the time of the tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving situation, the on scene deputy sheriffs did not know exactly what the suspect was swinging at them, but said they could tell it had a shiny blade attached to the end of it.<br><br>The deputy sheriffs moved back as the decedent aggressed towards them swinging the clippers. The swinging clippers were clearly swinging around in a very fast rotation as the deputy sheriffs could hear it making a whooshing sound as it passed through the air. Based on the speed of the clippers and way the decedent was wielding it, the deputy sheriffs feared that if the decedent was to strike someone with the clippers, it could cause great bodily injury to the person(s) it struck.<br><br>Due to the decedent's aggressive and dangerous behavior, the first deputy sheriff drew his duty weapon with his right hand and used his portable radio to request emergency assistance for an assault with a deadly weapon suspect. The second deputy pointed his Taser at the decedent.<br><br>When the decedent advanced toward the second deputy sheriff swinging clippers at eye level, within inches of his head and face, the second deputy sheriff announced he was going to activate the Taser. The second deputy sheriff deployed his Taser, aiming at the decedent's torso. The darts struck the decedent in the upper body, but again it appeared to have no effect on him. The decedent ripped the Taser darts out and continued advancing towards the deputy sheriffs. The deputy sheriffs had to move |

| | |
|---|---|
| | quickly to evade the decedent's aggressive advancements by backing and moving laterally to get away.<br><br>The decedent became fixated on the first deputy sheriff. The decedent looked directly at the first deputy sheriff and said, "I'm gonna fuck you up! I'm gonna kill you!" as he charged towards him and quickly swung the clippers over his head. Although the first deputy sheriff quickly stepped back and moved laterally, he was unable to get out of the way of the decedent's aggressive attack. As the decedent gained ground and came dangerously close, the first deputy sheriff feared that if the clippers struck him, he could get seriously injured, his eyes or throat could get cut, or he could get knocked out and the decedent could gain possession of his firearm. When the decedent came within three to five feet from the first deputy sheriff, the first deputy sheriff feared he would be seriously injured. The first deputy sheriff raised his left forearm to protect his head and face while with his right hand he brought his duty weapon down to his side hip and discharged four rounds toward the decedent.<br><br>The decedent fell to the ground onto his stomach with his hands under his body. The first deputy advised, via his portable radio, that he was involved in a shooting and requested medical assistance for the decedent.<br><br>When additional units arrived on scene, the deputy sheriffs approached the decedent and quickly rendered medical aid until paramedics from the Los Angeles County Fire Department arrived on scene.<br><br>The decedent was transported to Ronald Reagan Hospital where lifesaving medical care was administered. The decedent succumbed to his injuries and was pronounced dead at the hospital. |

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the shooting of a mentally ill man that was using a pair of metal hair clippers as a weapon against the on-scene deputy sheriffs.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was the lack of investigation regarding the decedent's alleged mental illness prior to contacting him.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the decedent's failure to comply with the lawful orders of Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs. Instead of obeying the deputy sheriffs' orders, the decedent armed himself with a pair of hair clippers that he used as a weapon and aggressively charged at the deputy sheriffs while swinging the weapon in a threatening manner.

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

**Criminal Investigation**
The incident was investigated by the Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

On February 21, 2018, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office concluded that the first deputy sheriff was honestly in fear that he would suffer great bodily injury at the time he fired his duty weapon. We further find that there is insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that his decision was unreasonable. The decedent threatened the first deputy sheriff's life and advanced rapidly toward him while swinging an edged weapon. Although the first deputy sheriff may have had other options available to him, there is insufficient evidence to prove that his split-second decision to use deadly force

in this situation was unreasonable. The District Attorney's Office indicated the case would be closed and they would take no further action in this matter.

**Administrative Investigation**

This incident was investigated by representatives of the Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The results of the investigation were presented to the Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication.

On January 11, 2019, the EFRC determined the use of deadly force and tactics were within 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)

Albert M. Maldonado, Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature: [signature] Date: 1/27/20

Name: (Department Head)

Matthew J. Burson, Chief
Professional Standards Division

Signature: [signature] Date: 1/28/20

**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)

Destiny Castro

Signature: [signature] Date: 1/30/2020

# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

## MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

## MARCH 2, 2020

**1. Call to Order.**

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:40 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 Adrienne Byers.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Millicent Rolon, Christopher Keosian, Lana Choi, Kelsey Nau, Richard Kudo, Kent Sommer, Jonathan McCaverty, and Eduardo Montelongo; Sheriff's Department: Marjory Jacobs, Alex Canchola, Pat Jordan, Kevin Pearcy, Kristine Corrales, Richard Marascola, Allen Castellano, David Sprenzel, and Eric Castano; Department of Public Works: David Gonazlez; Parks and Recreation: Malou Rubio, and Vicky Santana; Internal Services Department: Bryce Tyler, Araceli Aranda, and Shana Wilcher; Public Defender: Michael Suzuki, and Robert Kayne; Department of Health Services: Katie Mathers; and Outside Counsel: Laura Inlow, Andrew Pongralz, and Andrew Baum.

**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 9:45 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(i).

**4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.**

At 11:58 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

**a. <u>Angelena Sandifor, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.</u>**
**United States District Court Case No. CV-18-07650**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of sexual assault by a Sheriff Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of $1,700,000.

<u>Action Taken:</u>

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $1,700,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

b. **K.L., a minor by McGhee, Nijae, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**United States District Court Case No. 2:18-CV-4910**

This wrongful death and federal civil rights lawsuit arises out of the fatal shooting of Plaintiffs' son by a Sheriff Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of $1,025,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $1,025,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

c. **Louis Friedman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 647075**

This lawsuit alleges Plaintiff's federal civil rights were violated and he was subjected to retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of $99,999.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $99,999.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

d. **Leonar Gregorian v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**United States District Court Case No. 19-CV-07738 MWF (ASx)**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations and state-law negligence by a former inmate claiming that Sheriff's personnel were deliberately indifferent to his safety; settlement is recommended in the amount of $30,000.

Action Taken:

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

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

e. **Ren Zheng v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 670331**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an on-duty Sheriff's Deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of $495,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $495,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

f. **Lauren Paine v. Erik Alexander Cobian, et al.**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 636370**

This dangerous condition lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from injuries sustained in a solo vehicle accident in the unincorporated area of the County; settlement is recommended in the amount of $100,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $100,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

g. **Jane N.B. Doe v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 18STCV00604**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of sexual molestation by a Department of Parks and Recreation employee; settlement is recommended in the amount of $625,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $625,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

h. **Keela Castle v. County of Los Angeles**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV06099**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Internal Services Department was subjected to retaliation and discrimination based on gender, race and age; settlement is recommended in the amount of $350,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $350,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

i. **Gaspar Zavala v. Brown, Ronald, et al.**
**United States District Court Case No. CV 18-04472 SJO (ASx)**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations by a former Public Defender client who claims his constitutional rights were violated; settlement is recommended in the amount of $2,800,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $2,800,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

j. **Christy Mayfield v. County of Los Angeles**
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 686153**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to discrimination and harassment based on disability and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of $275,000.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $275,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

5. **Approval of the Minutes of the February 3, 2020, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

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 12:01 p.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By _____
Derek Stane