STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

HELD VIA ONLINE CONFERENCE CALL

ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 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 were on the public teleconference line to address the Claims Board or to listen to the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

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

a. Loyd Tucker v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court No. 2:18-CV-07864

This lawsuit alleges false allegations were made by social workers resulting in the removal of Plaintiff's children.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $160,000.

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

See Supporting Document

b. David Khoury v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 682926

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a motorcycle and a Fire Department vehicle.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $175,000.

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

See Supporting Document

c. **Paul Blumberg v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:10-CV-05072

This federal lawsuit alleges civil rights violations based on Plaintiff's prosecution and imprisonment.

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 Adrienne Byers

See Supporting Document

d. **Sarah Lewow v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 18STCV07415

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's patrol car.

Action Taken:

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

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

See Supporting Document

e. **Ryan Charles Twyman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:20-CV-00789

This wrongful death federal lawsuit arises out of the fatal Deputy-involved shooting of Plaintiff's son.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $3,900,000.

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

See Supporting Documents

f. **ALADS for John Doe (Kevin Boothe) v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 543199

This lawsuit alleges that an employee from the Sheriff's Department was subjected to violation of privacy and due process rights.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $400,000.

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

g. **Tui Wright v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCv40769

This lawsuit brought by a retired Sheriff's Sergeant alleges that he was subjected to discrimination and retaliation.*

* This item was approved for $99,000 at the August 3, 2020, Claims Board meeting, however, the amount was incorrect.

Action Taken:

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

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

h. **Jackie Gentry v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCv15876

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Public Works was subjected to disability discrimination.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $80,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – 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 September 14, 2020, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – 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		Loyd Tucker v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:18-cv-07864
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		July 24, 2018
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	160,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Pro per
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Jessie Lee Deputy County Counsel Jill Williams Carpenter, Rothans & Dumont
NATURE OF CASE		Plaintiff claims that his civil rights were violated when social workers made false allegations in petitions submitted to the juvenile court, resulting in the court removing the children from Plaintiff's custody. 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 $160,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	49,941
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	7,382

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		David Khoury v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		BC682926
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		November 9, 2017
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Los Angeles County Fire Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	175,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Wayne McClean
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Richard K. Kudo Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises out of a collision between a motorcycle operated by Plaintiff David Khoury and a Los Angeles County Fire Department fire engine driven by a Fire Department employee that occurred on November 5, 2016, at 650 East Gladstone Street, in the city of Glendora. 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	$	50,571
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	20,767

Case Name: David Khoury v. County of Los Angeles, et al. (BC682926)

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:	November 5, 2016
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	On November 5, 2016, a Fire Fighter Specialist (FFS) was operating a Quint and exiting from a fire station after refueling. FFS was clearing each lane at no more than 5 mph by looking left and right to cross the two eastbound lanes of Gladstone Street in order to attempt a left-turn onto the westbound lanes. Plaintiff was on a motorcycle traveling eastbound on Gladstone Street. When FFS saw Plaintiff, the quint had already crossed the number one eastbound lane. The collision between Plaintiff and the quint occurred approximately 1-2 seconds later. Plaintiff alleges that it was still daylight but also that the quint did not have its lights on. Given the incident occurred at approximately 6:53 p.m., it was not light out and the quint did have its lights on (however, no emergency lights and sirens as they were not responding to any emergency). Plaintiff alleges he was traveling 40 mph but slowed down to under 30 mph moments before the collision. Department personnel observed Plaintiff traveling at closer to 50 mph before the collision. When Plaintiff collided with the quint, Plaintiff's motorcycle slid under the quint and Plaintiff was thrown from the motorcycle. Plaintiff was able to stand and walk, but reported experiencing back and neck pain. Plaintiff was then airlifted to a medical center. Plaintiff was subsequently discharged after six hours without any concussion, broken bones, lacerations, or stitches.

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

The FFS failed to clear each lane as he attempted a left-hand turn.

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

1. The Department has worked with the FFS's jurisdictional deputy chief to create a specialized driver training specifically tailored for the FFS, as follows:

   - 1 hour of Intersection Safety for Emergency Vehicle Operators;
   - 1 hour of Driver Safety Orientation;

- 2.5 hours of Comprehensive Defensive Driver Training;
- 2.5 hours of EVOC;
- 1 hour of Safe Backing for Emergency Vehicle Operators;
- 3 hours of Defensive Driver Training;

The North Regional Operations Bureau was responsible and this was completed on January 9, 2020.

2. The Department has drafted guidelines for the Department to utilize in assessing vehicle accidents for training and potential referral for internal investigation.

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: Julia Kim Date: 1/22/2020

Name: (Department Head) DARYL OSBY

Signature: Daryl L. Osby Date: 01/30/2020

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: Destiny Castro Date: 1/5/2020

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Paul Blumberg v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:10-CV-05072
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		7/12/2010
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	30,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Gregory W. Moreno & Associates
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Richard Hseuh, Deputy Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $30,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, this federal lawsuit filed by Paul Blumberg against the County and former detective Brad Foss, alleging federal civil rights violations and State-law tort claims based on his prosecution and imprisonment. The Deputies deny the allegations and contend their actions were reasonable. 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 $30,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	320,617
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	5,093

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Sarah Lewow v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		18STCV07415
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		December 6, 2018
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Adam Savin, Esq. Law Offices of Savin & Bursk
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Michael J. Gordon Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		On December 17, 2016, Plaintiff Sarah Lewow's sedan was sideswiped by a vehicle that was being operated by a Sheriff's Department Sergeant who pulled away from the curb and into Ms. Lewow's path of travel on Devonshire Street, near Vassar Avenue, in the City of Los Angeles. Ms. Lewow alleges she sustained bodily injury and loss of earnings as a result of the incident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of $100,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	12,960
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	8,578

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Ryan Charles Twyman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		20-CV-00789
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		January 26, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	3,900,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Brian T. Dunn, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Millicent L. Rolon, Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $3,900,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a wrongful death and federal civil rights lawsuit filed by decedent Ryan Twyman's parents, Tommy and Charles Twyman, and his three minor children, by and through their Guardians ad Litem, and Daimeon Leffall after the fatal shooting of Ryan Twyman by Sheriffs' Deputies. 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 $3,900,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	10,207
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	0

Case Name: Tommy Twyman, et al. 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:	June 6, 2019, at approximately 7:30 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	**Tommy Twyman, et al. v. County of Los Angeles** Summary Corrective Action Plan 2020-12 On June 6, 2019, at approximately 7:30 p.m., two uniformed Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs assigned to Century Station, were on routine patrol (two-man unit) in a marked black and white patrol vehicle, when they received a cell phone call from an assigned Century Station, Operations Safe Streets (OSS) detective. The OSS detective told the first deputy sheriff (passenger) he was actively looking for a person of interest (decedent) who was known to be in possession of illegal firearms. The OSS detective also provided the first deputy sheriff with the decedent's name, physical description, vehicle and license plate (2015, white Kia, Forte) associated with the vehicle. The OSS detective told the first deputy sheriff the decedent was recently seen at the South Bay Villa Apartment Complex, a known area for the "Athens Park Bloods," a local street gang, and a high crime area. **Note:** Information about the decedent was given to Century station deputy sheriffs at a station briefing. After receiving the information, the deputy sheriffs drove to the south-east parking lot of the apartment complex located at 13111 South San Pedro Street, Los Angeles. **Note:** The parking lot and carport is a common area for the apartment complex. The parking lot has several covered parking stalls (carports) on the east and west side of the parking lot. As the deputy sheriffs entered the parking lot they saw the decedent's vehicle parked (engine turned off) in a parking stall facing west. The decedent's vehicle was parked next to a grey pickup truck. The first deputy sheriff confirmed the vehicle was the decedent's vehicle. The second deputy sheriff, who was driving, saw the decedent's vehicle windows were heavily tinted and unable to see if the vehicle was occupied. The second deputy sheriff positioned the patrol vehicle approximately 10 feet from the decedent's vehicle in order to contact the occupants in the vehicle and investigate. The deputy sheriffs exited the vehicle with their guns drawn. The first deputy sheriff approached the passenger's side back door of the vehicle and the second deputy sheriff approached the driver's side. As both deputy sheriff's stood on opposite side of the decedent's vehicle, they made multiple verbal commands to the occupants to roll the windows down, with no response from the occupants. However, both deputy sheriffs could see movement inside the decedent's vehicle.

	The first deputy sheriff was unsure if the occupants inside the decedent's vehicle heard the commands due to the windows being rolled up. The first deputy sheriff pulled the door handle to the rear passenger side door of the decedent's vehicle, which was unlocked. The second deputy sheriff pulled the door handle to the driver's side door, which was locked As the first deputy sheriff opened the rear passenger door he saw the decedent sitting in the driver's seat of the vehicle and another male sitting in the front passenger seat. The decedent immediately looked back at the first deputy sheriff and started the vehicles engine, the passenger looked back at the first deputy sheriff and crouched down in his seat. The first deputy sheriff stood between the open rear passenger side door frame of the decedent's vehicle. The first deputy with arm fully extended and his gun drawn made multiple verbal commands to the decedent to "turn the car off," while instructing the passenger to show him his hands. The decedent and passenger inside the vehicle did not comply with the verbal orders. The decedent put the vehicle in gear, turned the vehicle to the right, and accelerated backwards. The first deputy sheriff stood near the rear wheel of the decedent's vehicle between the door frame and the open rear passenger door. The decedent's turning movement and acceleration caused the vehicle to strike the first deputy sheriff's legs. The first deputy feared he would get caught underneath the decedent's moving vehicle and the decedent would run him over and kill him, fired his duty weapon five times at the decedent. The second deputy sheriff immediately saw a muzzle flash from inside the rear passenger area of the decedent's vehicle. Simultaneously, the first deputy sheriff heard the second deputy sheriff yell "gun, gun, gun." The second deputy sheriff fearing the first deputy sheriff was in immediate danger of serious injury or death, and was being dragged by the decedent's vehicle and shot at by the occupants, fired his duty weapon fifteen times at the decedent. The first deputy sheriff was able to free himself from the doorway of the decedent's vehicle, and fired his duty weapon an additional five times at the passenger side of the decedent's vehicle, as he moved to cover behind a grey parked pickup truck. The second deputy sheriff fired a second volley of rounds fearing the decedent was still a threat, for a total of seventeen shots. The decedent's vehicle continued to back up towards the west end of the parking lot. The second deputy sheriff still did not know how many occupants were in the vehicle or if they were armed. The second deputy sheriff created approximately 75 yards of distance between himself and the decedent's vehicle. The second deputy sheriff retrieved his AR-15 (duty rifle) from the trunk of his patrol vehicle. The second deputy sheriff could still see movement inside the decedent's vehicle through the bullet holes created in the window. The second deputy sheriff took a position of cover behind the bed of the grey pickup truck next to the first deputy sheriff.

	The first deputy sheriff made several verbal commands to the occupant's inside the decedent's vehicle to show their hands, but the occupants refused to comply. The second deputy sheriff feared the occupants were still a threat and fired his duty rifle seven times into both the front and rear passenger side of the decedent's vehicle. The second deputy sheriff heard a voice from inside the decedent vehicle say "he's dead, he's dead, I don't have a gun." The second deputy sheriff used his portable radio to report they had been involved in a shooting, asked for additional Department personnel, and requested paramedics. Once assisting patrol units arrived and a tactical plan was formulated, the second deputy sheriff used his P.A. system and gave verbal commands to the front passenger to exit the vehicle. The front passenger was taken into custody pending further investigation and later released. The second deputy sheriff made numerous verbal commands via the P.A. system to the decedent to exit the vehicle. The contact team approached the vehicle and observed the decedent, seated motionless and unresponsive in the driver's front seat. **Note:** The second deputy sheriff was not part of the arrest contact team. Los Angeles County Fire Department personnel responded to the scene. Although emergency medical care was administered to the decedent, he succumbed to his injuries and was pronounced dead at the scene. During the incident, the front passenger from the decedent's vehicle was taken to Harbor UCLA Medical Center by deputy sheriff personnel and medically evaluated. The front passenger was found to be uninjured by gunfire and only had glass fragments in his hair. During the decedent vehicle approach following the deputy involved shooting, deputy sheriffs ordered a woman (later identified as the decedent's fiancé) to leave the immediate scene. The woman refused to comply with numerous orders and had to be physically restrained and arrested for obstructing a peace officer.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the first deputy sheriff opening the decedent's rear passenger door and body placement as they attempted to detain the decedent at gun point before he reversed his vehicle.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was the failure to broadcast or obtain additional resources during the incident.

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 placed his vehicle in reverse and immediately accelerated towards the deputies.

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

This incident has been investigated by the Sheriff's Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

The investigation has been submitted to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for a determination as to whether the use of deadly force was legally justified and/or if any criminal misconduct occurred. At the time of the report, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office had not advised the Department of their findings.

Upon completion of the District Attorney's Office's findings the Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) will investigate this incident to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after the incident.

The California Government Code's Peace Officer Bill of Rights sets guidelines for administrative investigations statues dates. Once the Homicide Bureau and the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office investigations are complete, a statue date will be set regarding the administrative investigation.

When the IAB investigator completes the case, it will be submitted for approval. Approximately one month after the case is approved, the case will be presented to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for adjudication.

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:	Date: 7/28/20

Name: (Department Head)	
Matthew J. Burson, Chief Professional Standards Division	
Signature:	Date: 08/04/20

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)	
Signature:	Date:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:33 a.m. The meeting was held via teleconference with all Claims Board Members participating telephonically. Claims Board Members online for the teleconference meeting were: Chair Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers.

All other persons also appeared telephonically. Those attending the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Jessica Rivas, David Lee, Richard Hsueh, Melodie Larsen, Michael Gordon, Kent Sommer, Narbeh Bagdasarian, Camille Granville, and Nicole Davis Tinkham; Sheriff's Department: Johann Thrall, Dan Dyer, Darren Harris, Christopher Reed, Ronald Shaffer, Mark Allen, Melanie Rivers, and Kristine Corrales; Office of the District Attorney: Julie Dixon-Silva, and John New; Department of Public Works: Michael Hays, and Ronald Casteneda; Department of Health Services: Arun Patel, Dawn Abarca, Lan Foeur, Haya Nemtzov, and Claudia Aguirre; and Outside Counsel: Thomas Hurrell, and Tomas Guterres.

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 were on the public teleconference phone line to address the Claims Board.

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

At 9:35 a.m., the Chair convened the meeting into closed session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(i).

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

No members of the public were on the public teleconference phone line to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 11:40 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session via the public teleconference line and reported the actions taken in closed session as follows:

a. Non-Litigated Claims of Luz Gutierrez and Esperanza Martinez

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's Deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $22,115.

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

b. **Lindsay Potter v. Anthony Fredrick DiVita, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 18STCV03960

Ryan Randalls, et al. v. Anthony Fredrick DiVita, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 696606

Gabriel Carrillo, et al. v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 18STCV00347

These lawsuits arise from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff Transportation Bus.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $45,250.

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

c. **Alexander Arndt v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. CV 28-10699

This federal lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff's civil rights were violated while he was being escorted from a hiking trail by two Sheriff Deputies.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of $58,000.

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

d. **Roland Vaughan v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:19-CV-00336-FMO-SK

This federal lawsuit alleges civil rights violations arising from injuries sustained while Plaintiff was incarcerated at Men's Central Jail.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $875,000.

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

e. **Cassandra Parks v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 651145

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit against the Department of Public Works arises from a fatal automobile accident in the unincorporated area of the County near Santa Clarita.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $6,000,000.

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

f. **Regina Crenshaw v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 652399

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee with the District Attorney's office was subjected to gender and race discrimination.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $950,000.

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

g. **Rafael Rivera v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 626697

This wrongful death lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff's wife received inadequate care and treatment at Harbor UCLA Medical Center.

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 – Steve Robles, Arlene Barrera, and Adrienne Byers

h. **Claim of Alexander Moreno v. County of Los Angeles**

This wrongful death lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff's father received inadequate care at LAC +USC Medical Center.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of $298,430.

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

5. **Approval of the Minutes of the August 17, 2020, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes.

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 11:45 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By _____
Derek Stane