



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

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Oscar Valdez
Office of the Auditor-Controller
Destiny Castro
Chief Executive Office
Adrienne M. Byers
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

The Los Angeles County Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, July 1, 2024, at 9:30 a.m.**, at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Sixth Floor, Conference Room C, Los Angeles, California 90012. Members of the public who would like to listen to the open session of the meeting or would like to provide public comment may call (323) 776-6996, then enter ID 388 338 70# at 9:30 a.m. on July 1, 2024.

Reports of actions taken in Closed Session. The Los Angeles County Claims Board will report actions taken on any Closed Session Items on Monday, July 1, 2024, at approximately 12:00 p.m. Members of the public who would like to hear reportable actions taken on any Closed Session items may call (323) 776-6996, then enter ID 388 338 70# at 12:00 p.m. on July 1, 2024. Please note that these are approximate start times and there may be a short delay before the Closed Session is concluded and the actions can be reported.

TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT:

You may submit written public comments by e-mail to claimsboard@counsel.lacounty.gov or by mail to: Attention: Los Angeles County Claims Board, Executive Office, County Counsel, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012.

Written public comment or documentation must be submitted no later than 12:00 p.m. on Friday, June 28, 2024. Please include the agenda item and meeting date in your correspondence. Comments and any other written submissions will become part of the official record of the meeting.

If you wish to address the Los Angeles County Claims Board in person, you may come to the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, and enter on the Second Floor. Please advise the security guard station personnel that you would like to attend the public portion of the Claims Board meeting and a security guard will escort you to the Sixth Floor where you will be assisted.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Public comment is limited to the specific items on the agenda and general public comment is limited to subject matters within the jurisdiction of the Claims Board.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: The Agenda and any supporting documents will be posted at <https://lacounty.gov/newsroom/public-information/los-angeles-county-claims-board/> and can be provided upon request. Please submit requests for supporting documents to claimsboard@counsel.lacounty.gov.

If you would like more information, please contact Claims Board Secretary Laura Z. Salazar at lzsalaraz@counsel.lacounty.gov or Raina Mey RMey@counsel.lacounty.gov.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.
3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Government Code section 54956.9, subdivision (a)).

- a. Christopher Sandoval v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV38616

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department vehicle driven by an on-duty sergeant; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$66,350.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- b. Thad Woods v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No.: 2:23-cv-03533

This civil rights lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force and unlawful search and seizure when Plaintiff was detained by Sheriff's deputies during a traffic stop; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$99,950.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- c. Samuel Nelson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No.: 2:22-cv-00832

This civil rights lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force arising out of Plaintiff's detention and arrest by a Sheriff's deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$7,000,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- d. Carlos Towns v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-cv-01635

This civil rights lawsuit seeks compensation for the wrongful death of Decedent after he was fatally shot by Sheriff's deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$5,250,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- e. Xavier Vivian-Jones v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV11801

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department patrol vehicle driven by an on-duty deputy; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$140,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- f. William Rocco v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-cv-08598-FLA-RAO

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiffs sustained in a vehicle collision involving a firetruck driven by a firefighter paramedic; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- g. Kevina Denise Crawford v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV35018

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$100,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- h. Samantha Cortes, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV11184

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiffs sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee of the Department of Internal Services; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$50,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- i. Holly Zucker v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV42693

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained from a trip and fall incident at a County of Los Angeles park; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$75,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- j. Paola Araiza v. County of Los Angeles Department of Mental Health
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV04285

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Mental Health was subjected to disability discrimination, and failure to accommodate, and engage in the interactive process; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$145,000.

4. Approval of the Minutes of the June 17, 2024, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

[See Supporting Document](#)

5. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Christopher Sandoval vs. Los Angeles County Sheriff AKA Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
CASE NUMBER	20STCV38616
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	October 8, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 66,350
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Jeffrey L. Fayngor, Esq. The JLF Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	RICHARD K. KUDO Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This case involves an automobile intersection collision that occurred on October 15, 2019, in the City of Downey, when a Los Angeles Sheriff's Department sport-utility vehicle driven by an on-duty Sergeant traveling westbound on Lakewood Boulevard, entered the Lakewood Boulevard/Apollo Way intersection against a red traffic signal and was broadsided by Christopher Sandoval's ("Plaintiff") car that entered the intersection on a green traffic signal light. Plaintiff claims to have suffered injuries and damages from the accident.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 9,291
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 13,658

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Thad Woods v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:23-CV-03533
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	April 24, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 99,950
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Greg L. Kirakosian
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Minas Samuelian Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$99,950 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal and State civil rights lawsuit filed by Thad Woods ("Plaintiff") alleging excessive force, unlawful search and seizure arising out of Plaintiff's detention.</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 \$99,950 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 47,465
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 402

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Samuel Nelson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:22-CV-00832
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	February 7, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 7,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Cameron Sehat
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Minas Samuelian Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$7,000,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal and state civil rights lawsuit filed by Samuel Nelson ("Plaintiff"), alleging excessive force arising out of Plaintiff's detention and arrest.</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 \$7,000,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 160,682
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ \$16,499



Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	September 23, 2020, at approximately 4:00 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Summary Corrective Action Plan 2023-111</p> <p>Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.</p> <p>Based on the multiple investigative reports, on September 23, 2020, at approximately 4:00 p.m., the Deputy Sheriff who is assigned to Whittier Courthouse (7339 Painter Ave, Whittier, CA, 90602), finished working his shift; and while in civilian clothing, walked to the courthouse parking structure. Once inside the parking structure, the Deputy Sheriff observed an unknown male standing in between two parked vehicles near the northwest corner of the parking structure. As the Deputy Sheriff continued to walk towards his vehicle, he observed a second unknown male (Plaintiff) looking into his vehicle through the front windshield.</p> <p>The following statement is a summary of Homicide Bureau's Interview with Deputy One:</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff stated once he was inside of the parking structure, he observed an unknown male standing in between two parked vehicles. The first unknown individual made eye contact with the Deputy Sheriff as he stretched and yawned loudly all while looking over his left shoulder towards the employee parking area. As the unknown individual stepped from in between the parked vehicles, he looked at the Plaintiff, walked past the Deputy Sheriff and exited the parking structure.</p> <p>As he walked past the Deputy Sheriff, the Deputy Sheriff's attention was drawn to the Plaintiff. As the Deputy Sheriff continued to walk towards his vehicle when he saw the Plaintiff (standing near the driver's side [front] bumper of his vehicle) looking into his vehicle via the front windshield.</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff yelled at the Plaintiff, "What are you doing to my car?" The Plaintiff responded, "I dropped something." After being confronted, the Plaintiff discontinued looking for the dropped item and began to walk towards the parked vehicle on the west side of the aisle.</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff asked the Plaintiff, "What did you drop?" The Plaintiff replied, "Don't f**king worry about it." The Deputy Sheriff walked to his vehicle to ensure his vehicle had not been burglarized. Once the Deputy Sheriff confirmed his vehicle was not burglarized, he redirected his attention back to the Plaintiff. The Deputy Sheriff quickly removed his cellular phone from his pocket to record the Plaintiff "casing" vehicles inside of the parking structure.</p>

	<p>The Deputy Sheriff followed the Plaintiff as he walked to the exit located near the northeast corner of the parking structure.</p> <p>As the Plaintiff reached the parking structure exit, he turned and aggressively told the Deputy Sheriff to stop recording him. The Deputy Sheriff stated he was standing near a center wall inside of the parking structure when the Plaintiff aggressively approached him and quickly placed his right hand underneath his jacket near his waistband. The Deputy stated when the Plaintiff reached underneath his jacket, he believed the Plaintiff was reaching for a weapon.</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff did not believe he could physically outrun the Plaintiff due to a pulled hamstring and a bad back. [Instead of running], he identified himself as a Deputy Sheriff, drew his off-duty firearm, and pointed it at the Plaintiff. The Deputy Sheriff ordered the Plaintiff to show him his hands.</p> <p>After the Deputy Sheriff identified himself and held the Plaintiff at gunpoint, the Plaintiff replied, "I don't give a f**k!" and began tugging at the front of his waistband.</p> <p>Due to the Deputy Sheriff fearing the Plaintiff was armed with a weapon, and may be able to draw it from his waist, the Deputy Sheriff fired two rounds at the Plaintiff from his off-duty revolver. As the shots were fired, the Plaintiff bent at his waist and turned to his left. When the Plaintiff turned to his left, the Deputy Sheriff observed the Plaintiff continuing to fumble and tug at his waistband.</p> <p>Due to the Deputy Sheriff's sustained fear for his safety and the Plaintiff's continued effort to retrieve a possible weapon, the Deputy Sheriff fired a third round from his off-duty firearm. After the third round, the Plaintiff's legs went "limp," and the Plaintiff fell on his stomach. The Deputy Sheriff ordered the Plaintiff not to reach for his "gun." The Plaintiff replied, "I was not reaching for a gun, but a knife." As the Plaintiff rolled over, the Deputy Sheriff could see a red box cutter knife attached to the front of the Plaintiff's waistband.</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff continued to hold the Plaintiff at gunpoint while he called for emergency medical services.</p> <p>The Deputy Sheriff stayed at the location and gave the responding Whittier Police Officer a statement, after which he was escorted to the Whittier Courthouse by one of his supervisors and awaited Homicide Investigators. Upon speaking to the Homicide Detectives, he stated he attempted to locate the video of the incident on his cellphone, but he could not find the video recording. The Deputy Sheriff then realized he did not capture the incident on his cellular phone.</p> <p>Whittier Police Department's Detective's Observations:</p> <p>While the Deputy Sheriff was on the telephone with the 9-1-1 Dispatcher, a pick-up truck entered the parking structure. A detective from Whittier Police Department exited the truck and approached the Deputy Sheriff. The Detective ensured the Deputy Sheriff was off-duty law enforcement and began rendering aid to the Plaintiff. The Detective observed the Plaintiff sustained a gunshot wound. As the Detective lifted the Plaintiff's shirt, in search of additional gunshot wounds.</p>
--	--

	<p>The Detective observed the Plaintiff had a "construction type" folding knife clipped to the Plaintiff's belt. The Detective rolled the Plaintiff over, he observed an additional gunshot wound.</p> <p>During the Detective's medical assessment, he observed a glass pipe protruding from the Plaintiff's front right pocket.</p> <p>Responding Whittier Police Department's personnel secured the scene with crime scene tape, effectively closing the sidewalk to the public.</p> <p>Upon being notified of the shooting, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's Homicide Bureau Detectives arrived and assumed control of the investigation.</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Fire Department responded and rendered medical aid to the Plaintiff.</p> <p>The Plaintiff was transported to the hospital for medical treatment for his gunshot wounds.</p> <p>On Tuesday, March 16, 2021, the District Attorney's Office reviewed the case and declined to file charges against the Plaintiff. The District Attorney indicated there was sufficient evidence to file violations of Health and Safety section 11377 - Possession of a controlled substance, Health and Safety section 11364 - Possession of Drug Paraphernalia and Penal Code section 415 - Disturbing the Peace but declined to file those charges based on Los Angeles DA Special Directive 20-07's - Misdemeanor Declination Policy.</p> <p>Additionally, The District Attorney's Office declined to file charges in violation of Penal Code sections 664/459 - Attempted Burglary, Penal Code section 136.1- Witness Tampering and Penal Code section 417 - Brandishing a Weapon, and Penal Code section 245 - Assault with a deadly weapon, due to insufficient evidence.</p>
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Deputy Sheriff's discharge of his off-duty firearm.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Deputy Sheriff's involvement in an active Law Enforcement situation while off-duty.

A non-**Department** root cause in this incident was, The Plaintiff aggressively advanced toward the Deputy Sheriff and reached towards his waistband as if reaching for a weapon.

A non-**Department** root cause in this incident was the Plaintiff did not comply with the lawful verbal commands given by the Deputy Sheriff, who identified himself as a law enforcement officer and presented his firearm.

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

Criminal Investigation

This incident was investigated by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred. The investigative materials of the incident were submitted to the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Justice System Integrity Division for evaluation and filing consideration.

On November 22, 2022, the District Attorney's Office completed its review of the September 23, 2020, non-fatal shooting of the Plaintiff and concluded there is insufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Deputy One was not acting in lawful self-defense.

Administrative Investigation

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.

Incident Debriefing

A debriefing was conducted by area supervision. The briefing consisted of the following:

- Tactical issues.
- Safety concerns for personnel walking to and from the parking structure.

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)

Thomas KSM
Julia M. Valdes, A/Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:

Thomas KSM

Date:

5-10-24

Name: (Department Head)

Holly A. Francisco, Assistant Sheriff
Countywide Operations

Signature:

Holly Francisco

Date:

6-11-27

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: Daniela Prowizor-Lacayo (Risk Management Inspector General)

Signature:

Daniela Prowizor

Date:

6/12/2024

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME Carlos Towns v. County of Los Angeles, et al.

CASE NUMBER 23-CV-01635

COURT United States District Court

DATE FILED March 7, 2023

COUNTY DEPARTMENT Sheriff's Department

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT \$ 5,250,000

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF Caree Harper

COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY Millicent L. Rolon
Principal Deputy County Counsel

NATURE OF CASE This is a recommendation to settle for \$5,250,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by decedent Charles Towns' two children ("Plaintiffs"), after he was fatally shot by Los Angeles Sheriff's Department ("LASD") 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 \$5,250,000 is recommended.

PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE \$ 83,619

PAID COSTS, TO DATE \$ 6,512

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Xavier Vivian-Jones vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV11801
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 26, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 140,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	SCOTT E. BRAYBROOKE, ESQ. Voss, Silverman & Braybrooke, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA A. MCCAVERY Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This incident occurred on August 22, 2019, at the intersection of Normandie Avenue and Century Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles, California. A Sheriff's Deputy was responding to an officer assistance call. Sheriff's Deputy did not slow down when he entered the intersection against a red traffic signal, and collided with Plaintiff's vehicle. 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	\$ 2,250
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 40.75



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:	August 22, 2019
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Summary Corrective Action Plan 2023-148</p> <p>Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.</p> <p>Based on multiple investigative reports, on Wednesday, August 22, 2019, at approximately 2320 hours, Deputy One (driver) and his partner, Deputy Two (passenger), responded unauthorized Code-3 to an assistance request from a patrol unit regarding a deputy-involved in a fight.</p> <p>Deputy One was traveling north in the number one lane when he entered the intersection against a solid red traffic light. As Deputy One entered the intersection, he failed to clear the intersection lane-by-lane for vehicular traffic. The Plaintiff was traveling west on Century Boulevard in the number two lane when the Plaintiff's vehicle collided with the deputy sheriff's rear of his vehicle.</p> <p>After the collision, the Plaintiff indicated he did not see and/or hear the deputy sheriff's overhead lights and siren.</p> <p>The Plaintiff's vehicle sustained major traffic collision damage to the front bumper, hood, and driver's side front quarter panel.</p> <p>The patrol vehicle sustained major damage to the driver's side rear quarter panel and rear door.</p> <p>The Los Angeles County Fire Department responded to the location. The Plaintiff was treated at the location by LACo Fire Department for the injuries he sustained in the traffic collision.</p> <p>Deputy One was transported to the hospital for further medical treatment.</p> <p>Deputy Two complained of pain to the left side of his body. He was treated at the hospital for further medical treatment.</p> <p>A Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Sergeant was notified of the traffic collision and responded to the location.</p> <p>The Sergeant authored a Supervisor's Report of Incident or Damage to County Vehicle investigation.</p>

	<p>A California Highway Patrol (C.H.P.) Officer responded to the location and conducted a traffic collision investigation. His investigation concluded Deputy One was the primary cause of the traffic collision by failing to stop at a circular red light, in violation of California Vehicle Code Section – 21453 (a).</p>
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident is Deputy One's failure to stop for a red light.

A **Department** root cause in this incident is Deputy One's failure to clear the intersection lane-by-lane prior to entering the intersection.

A Department root cause in this incident is Deputy One's failure to receive authorization to respond Code-3

A **Department** root cause in this incident is Deputies One and Two's failure to utilize the patrol vehicle's seatbelt.

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

Traffic Collision Investigation

The traffic collision was investigated by representatives from the California Highway Patrol.

The collision investigation concluded the Deputy Sheriff was the primary cause of the collision by failing to stop at a circular red light, in violation of California Vehicle Code Section – 21453 (a).

Administrative Investigation

The incident was investigated by a representative from the Sheriff's Department to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred stemming from the traffic collision. The results of the investigation were presented for Department executive adjudication.

An executive evaluation found the collision was preventable and appropriate administrative action was taken.

The Deputy Sheriff involved in this incident received training surrounding the circumstances pertaining to this incident.

Traffic Collision Assessment and Review

South Los Angeles Station conducted a review and assessment of their traffic collisions for the calendar year 2019 through the end of 2023. The audit revealed the following:

- 51 preventable collisions occurred during the past five years.

- The most common causal factor was unsafe backing and/or inattentiveness.

Based on the results of the audit, a comprehensive traffic collision reduction plan was developed and implemented at South Los Angeles Station in early 2022. Since the implementation of the plan, there has been a reduction of on-duty preventable traffic collisions at the station.

Sheriff Department Announcement - Department Wide Re-brief

It is essential to maintain heightened officer safety, common sense, and sound tactics to reduce collision-related injuries, deaths, and financial liability to the Department.

The following Sheriff's Department policies were re-briefed:

- 3-01/090.07 - Use of Seatbelts
- 5-09/200.00 - Emergency Driving Policies
- 5-09/200.30 – Vehicle Speeds
- 5-09/200.35 – Code 3 Vehicle Operation and Tactics

3. Are the corrective actions addressing Department-wide system issues?

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)

Julia M. Valdés, A/Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:



Date:

06/10/2024

Name: (Department Head)

Myron Johnson, Assistant Sheriff
Patrol Operations

Signature:



Date:

6/12/24

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: Daniela Prowizor-Lacayo (Risk Management Inspector General)

Signature:

Daniela
Daniela Prowizor Prowizor

Digitally signed by Daniela
Prowizor
Date: 2024.06.20 12:56:09
-07'00'

Date:

6/20/2024

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	William Rocco, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:23-cv-08598-FLA (RAOx)
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	December 21, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Fire Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Gary Dordick, Esq. Dordick Law Corporation Adam Ainslie, Esq. Collins + Collins, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Melissa A. McCaverty Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This incident occurred on February 3, 2021, when Los Angeles County Fire Department Firefighter Paramedic Martin's County 2014 Dodge Ram truck collided with a 2014 Mazda 2 sedan driven by Mary Rocco, with Plaintiff William Rocco as a passenger on 20th Street West in Lancaster. Plaintiffs' alleges they sustained injuries and damages.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final global settlement of the case in the amount of \$100,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 63,701
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 65,497

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Kevina Denise Crawford vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV35018
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	September 23, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Children and Family Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Stanislav Pekler, Esq. Frish Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Melissa A. McCaverty, Esq. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on December 2, 2020, when an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services collided with Plaintiff's vehicle on Jakes Way in the City of Santa Clarita.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 21,618
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 11,699

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Samantha Cortes, et al. vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22STCV11184
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	April 1, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Internal Services Department (ISD)
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ \$28,900 to Marisol Cortes; \$15,250 to Cristina Sanchez; and \$5,850 to Samantha Cortes
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Nareh Terzian, Esq. Shaun Bauman, Esq. Bauman Law APLC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Melissa A. McCaverty, Esq. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on August 10, 2021, when an employee of the Internal Services Department collided with Plaintiffs' vehicle on Miles Avenue in the City of Huntington Park.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 16,197
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 22,288

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Holly Zucker vs. County of Los Angeles
CASE NUMBER	20STCV42693
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	November 9, 2020
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Beaches and Harbors
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 75,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	John Carpenter, Esq. Carpenter & Zuckerman
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Kevin J. Engelen Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a dangerous condition of public property lawsuit that arises from a trip and fall accident that occurred on September 8, 2019, when Ms. Zucker tripped and fell over an upraised portion of Aubrey E. Austin Jr. Memorial Park. The complaint alleges Ms. Zucker suffered injuries as a result of her fall and the Department of Beaches and Harbors is responsible for allowing the concrete within the park to constitute a dangerous condition of public property.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 187,886
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 41,787

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

June 17, 2024

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:35 a.m. The meeting was held virtually with Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro, Claims Board Member Oscar Valdez, Claims Board Member Adrienne M. Byers, and Claims Board Secretary Laura Z. Salazar participating in person at the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Sixth Floor, Conference Room C, Los Angeles, California 90012.

All other participants at the Claims Board meeting appeared virtually: Michael Gordon, Behnaz Tashakorian, Kevin Engelen, Anthony Morrone, Maryanne Koussa, and Mikayla Grande appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Brian Mejia and Donald Limbrick appeared for the Department of Parks and Recreation. Ronald Castaneda, Jacklin Injijian, and Michele Chimienti appeared for the Department of Public Works. Christina Lee appeared for the Department of Children and Family Services. Arnetta Counts and Simone Agee appeared for the Department of Public Social Services. Mihir Desai appeared for Kjar McKenna & Stockalper. Allen L. Thomas appeared for Thomas Law Firm, Inc. Jesse B. Levin appeared for Glaser Weil.

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

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

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

At 9:35 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(e).

4. Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

Hilary Gibson was on the public teleconference phone line to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 11:03 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session to report the actions taken in closed session as follows:

a. Favian Villalpando v. County of Los Angeles Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV27632

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained from a slip and fall incident that occurred at City Terrace Park.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4.a. in the amount of \$80,000.

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

**b. Lydia Cardenas v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC688501**

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained from a trip and fall incident in unincorporated East Los Angeles.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4.b. in the amount of \$92,500.

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

**c. California Apartment Association v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCP01114**

This writ action against the County of Los Angeles arises from provisions of the COVID-19 Tenant Protections Resolution whereby the Court granted the writ and Petitioner is entitled to attorneys' fees.

Action Taken:

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

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

**d. Craig D. Milligan v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22AVCV00956**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a traffic collision that occurred when an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services rear-ended Plaintiff's vehicle.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4.d. in the amount of \$51,500.

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

**e. Deborah D. Allen v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV25913**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Public Social Services was subjected to sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4.e. in the amount of \$40,000.

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

5. Approval of the Minutes for the June 3, 2024, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the June 3, 2024, meeting.

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

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By



Laura Z. Salazar

Claims Board Secretary