



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CLAIMS BOARD

500 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

John Naimo
Auditor-Controller
Steve Robles
Chief Executive Office
Roger H. Granbo
Office of the County Counsel

NOTICE OF MEETING

The County of Los Angeles Claims Board will hold a regular meeting on **Monday, March 6, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.**, in the Executive Conference Room, 648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Los Angeles, California.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Claims Board on items of interest that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Claims Board.
3. Closed Session – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9).
 - a. Daniel Serrano and Wendy Navarette v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 608 212

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 \$53,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)
 - b. Kelsey Martin and Melinda Brown v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 585 470

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 \$35,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- c. Julie and Layazel Dumbrique v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 585 174

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving a Sheriff's Department utility truck; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$50,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- d. Teshawn Gathier v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. CV 15-9264

This lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations, battery, and negligence after Plaintiff was shot by Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$72,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- e. Angela Carr v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 51 601

This lawsuit alleges Plaintiff's federal civil rights were violated when a Sheriff's Sergeant unlawfully seized and search her cell phone during a traffic stop; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$90,000.

[See Supporting Document](#)

- f. Rodonna Laffitte, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 526 786

This wrongful death lawsuit concerns allegations of excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies during an attempted apprehension; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$1,500,000.

[See Supporting Documents](#)

- g. Complaint of Chychy Ekeochah

This Department of Fair Employment and Housing complaint concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination, harassment based on disability, and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$62,500.

h. Complaint of Edward Flores

This Department of Fair Employment and Housing complaint concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination, harassment based on disability, and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$62,500.

i. Complaint of Madrona Robertson

This Department of Fair Employment and Housing complaint concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination, harassment based on disability, and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$62,500.

j. Complaint of Jan Williams

This Department of Fair Employment and Housing complaint concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination, harassment based on disability, and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$62,500.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.
5. Approval of the minutes of the February 6, 2017, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

[See Supporting Document](#)

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

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Daniel Serrano and Wendy Navarette vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC608212
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	January 26, 2016
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 53,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Michael S. Braun, Esq. Law Offices of Michael S. Braun
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Bruce W. Cochran, Esq. Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on May 21, 2015, on Whittier Boulevard and McDonnell Avenue, in the city of East Los Angeles when Plaintiff Daniel Serrano's vehicle collided with a Sheriff's Deputy vehicle. Daniel Serrano and Wendy Navarette claim injuries as a result of 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	\$ 33,328
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 6,029

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Kelsey E. Martin and Melinda S. Brown vs. County of Los AngelesCounty, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC585470
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	June 17, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 35,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Mindy S. Bish, Esq. Bish Law
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Bruce W. Cochran, Esq. Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on June 29, 2014, on Hollywood Boulevard and La Brea Avenue in the city of Los Angeles, when Plaintiff Kelsey Martin was rear-ended by a vehicle driven by a Sheriff's Deputy. Plaintiffs Martin and Brown claim injuries as a result of 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	\$ 41,440
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 2,995

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Julie and Layazel Dumbrique vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC585174
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	June 15, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 50,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Ramin Soofer, Esq. Law Offices of Ramin Soofer
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Bruce W. Cochran Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on November 7, 2014, on Alameda Street and North Los Angeles Street, in the City of Los Angeles when Plaintiff Julie Dumbrique was rear-ended by a 2014 Ford F-150 truck driven by a Sheriff's Department employee. Julie and Layazel Dumbrique both claim injuries as a result of 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	\$ 38,595
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 9,369

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Teshawn Gathier v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	CV 15-9264
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	December 1, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 72,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Dale K. Galipo, Esquire Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$72,500, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a lawsuit filed by Teshawn Gathier against the County and a Sheriff's Deputy, alleging federal civil rights violations, battery, and negligence after he was shot by Deputies.</p> <p>The Deputies claim their actions were reasonable under the circumstances.</p> <p>Due to 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 \$72,500 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 141,792
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 6,775

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Angela Carr v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 571601
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	February 6, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 90,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Randy McMurray, Esquire McMurray & Henriks, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Edwin Lewis Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$90,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Angela Carr against the County, the Sheriff's Department, and a Sheriff's Sergeant alleging the Sergeant unlawfully seized and searched her cell phone during a traffic stop.</p> <p>Due to the high 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 \$90,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 24,437
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 1,577

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Rodonna Laffitte, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 526786
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	November 6, 2013
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 1,500,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Randy H. McMurray & Yana Henriks McMurray Henriks, LLP and Wayne P. Higgins Higgins & Associates
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Joseph Langton Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$1,500,000, the lawsuit filed by Rodonna Laffitte and others, against the County and Sheriff's Deputies alleging that their civil rights were violated on May 18, 2013.</p> <p>The Deputies deny the allegations and contend their actions were reasonable.</p> <p>Due to 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 \$1,500,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 222,306
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 43,646

Case Name: Rodonna Laffitte, 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:	May 18, 2013, at approximately 9:00 p.m.
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p><u>Rodonna Laffitte, et al. v. County of Los Angeles</u> Summary Corrective Action Plan 2016-045</p> <p>On May 18, 2013, at approximately 9:00 p.m., two uniformed deputy sheriffs on patrol in the Firestone area observed the decedent riding a bicycle eastbound on 60th Street without any lights (in violation of California Vehicle Code section 21201[d][1]). The decedent was observed wearing a dark, bulky, hooded sweatshirt and long shorts. The deputy sheriffs followed the decedent, who turned right into the southbound lane of Miramonte Boulevard.</p> <p>The passenger deputy illuminated the decedent with his spotlight. The decedent then rode his bike across the southbound lane, about five to six yards in front of the patrol car. The deputy sheriffs considered the decedent's riding maneuver as an indication of possible intoxication (a possible violation of California Vehicle Code section 21200[a]). After crossing in front of the patrol car, the decedent continued riding southbound on Miramonte Boulevard in the northbound lane (a violation of California Vehicle code section 21202[a]).</p> <p>The deputy sheriffs shouted, "Sheriff's Department, stop!" out the window, but the decedent kept pedaling fast until he turned eastbound into the driveway of a multi-residence property at the location¹.</p> <p>The decedent crashed his bike into a fence then walked away on foot towards the back of the property. The driver deputy parked the patrol car in the apron of the driveway, and both deputy sheriffs exited and followed the decedent up the driveway. Both deputy sheriffs were unfamiliar with the decedent and this residence. They did not notify dispatch because they did not believe they were initiating a foot pursuit or that the decedent posed any significant risk.</p> <p>The deputy sheriffs walked up the driveway single-file, calling out, "Sheriff's Department," to announce their presence, and instructed the decedent to stop and put his hands on his head. The decedent did not stop. After they rounded the southeast corner of the house, the first deputy sheriff grabbed the decedent's left arm. The decedent turned counter-clockwise and used his right fist to punch the first deputy sheriff on his chin. The impact of the punch caused the first deputy sheriff to stumble backwards and become temporarily disoriented. The second deputy sheriff responded to the attack by punching the decedent on the face, but the strike appeared to have no effect on the decedent. Almost</p>

¹ It was later determined that the decedent lived in one of the four residences at the location.

	<p>immediately, the decedent tackled both deputies to the ground and began fighting.</p> <p>Within seconds of going to the ground, the deputy sheriffs and the decedent were surrounded by persons² who had come out of the house. These persons were yelling for the deputy sheriffs to let the decedent go, and they used language indicative of having gang affiliations. One of the house's occupants kicked the second deputy sheriff in the right side of his body. Another house occupant grabbed the decedent and attempted to pull him away from the deputy sheriffs. The second deputy sheriff had to continue struggling with the decedent while partially diverting his attention to keep the house's occupants back. The second deputy sheriff had to use force on three of the house's occupants³ to keep them from pulling the decedent away and also to keep them back from the incident.</p> <p>After approximately ten seconds into fighting on the ground, the first deputy sheriff was able to request help via his hand held radio. Because the first deputy sheriff was still dazed from being hit and tackled, he gave their location as, "58 and Miramonte," instead of their actual location of 6102 Miramonte. Approximately one and a half minutes into the fight, the first deputy sheriff recalled the correct address of their location and used his radio a second time to give their specific and correct location⁴.</p> <p>Approximately three minutes after the decedent tackled the deputy sheriffs to the ground and continued to fight with them, the deputy sheriffs struggled to gain control of the decedent, without success. The deputy sheriffs also continued to monitor the hostile crowd and tried to keep them from intervening.</p> <p>During their fight and struggle, the second deputy sheriff felt the decedent grab his gun. The second deputy sheriff yelled out, "Hey, he's grabbing my gun, he's grabbing my gun." The first deputy sheriff then used his sap⁵ to strike the decedent several times (8-10) in his rear torso, with some effect. The second deputy sheriff was able to maintain control of his firearm.</p> <p>The first deputy sheriff applied a handcuff on the decedent's left wrist but was unable to keep control of the decedent because he was violently moving and jerking his arms and body.</p> <p>While the decedent was stomach down on the ground, the first deputy sheriff saw the decedent holding a small revolver in his left hand, which he appeared to have retrieved from his person. The decedent was moving the gun up and down near the rear of his own waistband area. When the first deputy sheriff observed the gun, he yelled out to his partner, "Gun, gun, he's got a gun! He's going to shoot!" The second deputy sheriff did not see the gun, but based on the tone of his partner's voice, he was in fear for his life and/or the life of others. As a result, the second deputy sheriff shot the decedent in the back of his head from a distance of about one foot. Almost simultaneously, because he was also</p>
--	---

² The occupants of the home who exited the residence were later determined to be family and relatives of the decedent.

³ The three occupants that the second deputy used force against are included as plaintiffs in this case.

⁴ Throughout the incident, both deputy sheriffs used their portable radios several times to request additional units.

⁵ A sap is a an impact weapon that consists of a leather "pouch" filled with lead shot with a rounded (striking) end.

	<p>in fear for his life, the life of his partner, and any possible bystanders, the first deputy sheriff shot the decedent in the back of his thigh.</p> <p>The decedent became motionless as soon as the shots were fired. Paramedics were summoned to the location to provide medical care, but the decedent was pronounced dead at the scene.</p> <p>Two handguns were recovered from the decedent's possession. One handgun was a five-shot revolver firearm, which was found to be unloaded. The second handgun was a replica air pistol⁶ loaded with steel BBs and no red tip⁷ on the barrel.</p>
--	--

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the radio transmission broadcasting the incorrect location. Summoning assisting deputies to the correct location earlier may have potentially afforded greater physical control of the decedent.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was the absence of a Taser device carried by either deputy. Utilization of a Taser may have incapacitated the decedent long enough to enable the deputies to control him before he obtained his handgun.

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 orders, the decedent assaulted the deputies and ultimately retrieved a firearm from his person.

Another **non-Department** root cause in this incident was the gathering of the hostile crowd. Members of the crowd kicked one deputy and attempted to pull the decedent from the deputy sheriffs. These actions diverted the deputies' attention away from the decedent and inhibited their ability to control him.

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

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

On December 9, 2013, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office concluded the deputy sheriffs acted lawfully, in self-defense and in the defense of others, when they used deadly force against the decedent.

This incident was investigated by representatives of the Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Bureau to determine if any administrative misconduct occurred before, during, or after this incident. The investigation results were presented to an Executive Force Review Committee (EFRC) for evaluation. On November 20, 2014, the EFRC determined the use of deadly force and tactics were within Department policy.

⁶ Replica air pistols are made to look and have similar function to an actual manufactured firearm. In this incident, the second handgun the decedent was armed with was a Crosman, model P10 "Phantom," air pistol. The replica in this incident has a metal barrel, plastic slide, a black colored grip, that shoots CO2 propelled steel BBs at 480 feet per second, and looks like an actual Beretta PX4 "Storm," semiautomatic firearm.

⁷ California Penal Code section 20150(a) states any person who alters, removes or obliterates any coloration or markings for an imitation or replica firearm is guilty of a misdemeanor.

The EFRC recommended the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department purchase enough Tasers to equip all patrol personnel assigned to Century Station.

Pursuant to the Executive Force Review Committee findings, Century Station has purchased enough Tasers in order for each deputy sheriff patrol unit including sergeants, to be equipped with one during their shift.

Century Station has implemented a recurrent Taser training program to improve device familiarization and use. The Taser training incorporates scenario-based situations as well as a written examination.

Emergency radio broadcast procedures have also been implemented utilizing both scenario-based situations as well as recurrent review of policies and procedures.

Additional training for all deputy sheriffs assigned to Century Station will be sought at the Tactics and Survival Unit regarding responses to critical incidents. Classes will be scheduled utilizing the Department Situation Simulation Trailer and the Multiple Interactive Learning Objective platform. Century Station field training officers have already attended this training as a group.

Century Station has also been approved as an off-site Arrest & Control training facility, fulfilling the criteria for the Arrest & Control portion of Continued Professional Training (CPT). Department-certified force instructors teach blocks of Arrest & Control on a regular basis, with emphasis on control of a suspect while on the ground.


County of Los Angeles
Summary Corrective Action Plan


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



☐ Yes – The corrective actions address Department-wide system issues.

☒ No – The corrective actions are only applicable to the affected parties.

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator)	
Scott E. Johnson, Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature: 	Date: 1-24-17

Name: (Department Head)	
Karyn Mannis, Chief Professional Standards Division	
Signature: 	Date: 01-26-17

Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY	
Are the corrective actions applicable to other departments within the County?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the corrective actions potentially have County-wide applicability.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, the corrective actions are applicable only to this Department.	
Name: (Risk Management Inspector General)	
	
Signature: 	Date: 1/30/2017

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

FEBRUARY 6, 2017

1. Call to Order.

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:31 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 John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo.

Other persons in attendance at the meeting were: Office of the County Counsel: Jonathan McCaverty, Kevin Engelen, Richard Kudo, Jessie Lee, Craig Hoetger, Julie Ting, and Narbeh Bagdasarian; Sheriff's Department: Chris Perez, Keith Swensson, Kevin Percy, and Dominic Dannan; Department of Public Works: William Winter and Dominic Osmena; Department of Parks and Recreation: Donald Limbrick; Department of Mental Health: Margo Morales and Damien Parker; Department of Children and Family Services: Karla Hernandez; Department of Public Health: Ferdows Rashidian; Department of Health Services: Karen White; and Outside Counsel: Diana Ratcliff.

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 9:33 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(h) below.

4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.

At 11:00 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

- a. Maria Bermudez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 578 447
Yeris Avelar, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 626 477

These wrongful death lawsuits concern allegations of excessive force by Sheriff's Deputies while responding to a 911 call.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$250,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

b. Non-Litigated Claim of Luis Kao and Julie Teoh

This claim seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works for real and personal property damages allegedly caused from a backflow of sewage due to a sewer mainline blockage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$32,894.08 (includes pre-payment of \$11,064.29).

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

**c. Justin S., a minor by and through his Guardian Ad Litem, Margarita Ramirez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 483 559**

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from injuries plaintiff received from a fall while on the playground at Ruben Salazar Park.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$40,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

**d. Elisa Yanez v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 517 322**

This lawsuit concerns allegations of personal injury by a garage entry gate at a Department of Mental Health Facility.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$1,500,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

**e. Sandra Gabriel, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court Case No. 2:15-CV-03118**

This lawsuit alleges plaintiffs' civil rights were violated when the Department of Children and Family Services detained her four minor children without a warrant.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$140,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

f. **Constance Johnson v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 570 876

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to discrimination, harassment based on age and gender, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$250,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

g. **Kimberly Nguyen v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 589 086

This lawsuit alleges that an employee of the Department of Public Health was subjected to retaliation.

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 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

h. **Jane Doe v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 561 292

This lawsuit concerns allegations of medical malpractice and privacy breach while Plaintiff was a patient of the Emergency Department 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 \$497,000.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

5. **Approval of the minutes of the January 9, 2017, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the minutes.

Vote: Ayes: 3 – John Naimo, Steve Robles, and Roger Granbo

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 11:02 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By 
Sandra C. Ruiz