



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, June 5, 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. Vladimir Factor v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 575 259

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an on-duty employee from the Department of Public Health; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$30,000.

See Supporting Document

- b. Ernesto Pena, Jr., by and through his Guardian Ad Litem, Emiliano Pena v. Marie Girolamo, et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 568 400

This lawsuit arises from allegations that a Public Defender failed to provide Plaintiff, a mentally incompetent adult, with adequate and legal representation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$489,500.

See Supporting Documents

- c. N.L.A., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
United States District Court Case No. CV 15-02431

This wrongful death lawsuit concerns allegations of federal civil rights violations and excessive force when Plaintiff was shot while he fought and fled from Sheriff's Deputies; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$2,970,000.

See Supporting Documents

- d. Claim of Tenaya Brown

Claimant alleges that the Sheriff's Department failed to protect her from false rumors which caused her ongoing humiliation, mental and physical distress, and irreparable harm to her reputation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$45,000.

See Supporting Document

- e. Fernando Anaya v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 597 110

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Sheriff's Department was subjected to discrimination and retaliation on the basis of his disability, and that the Department failed to engage in an interactive process or provide reasonable accommodation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$75,000.

- f. Non-Litigated Claim of Humberto Cortez

\* This claim arises from alleged damages sustained in a vehicle versus motorcycle accident involving an on-duty employee from the Fire Department; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$30,000.

See Supporting Document

- g. Wiley Cranney v. County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 619 749

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Fire Department was subjected to age and disability discrimination, harassment, and retaliation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$92,000.

- h. Shahidah Carter v. County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 559 177

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Child Support Services Department was subjected to discrimination, and harassment, and that the Department failed to engage in an interactive process to provide reasonable accommodation; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$96,000.

- i. Darick Hendrix v. County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 553 018

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to gender and disability discrimination, sexual harassment, and retaliation, and that the Department failed to engage in the interactive process to accommodate his disability; settlement is recommended in the amount of \$137,500.

- 4. Report of actions taken in Closed Session.
- 5. Approval of the minutes of the May 15, 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	Vladimir Factor v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC575259
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 12, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Public Health
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 30,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Sepehr Omrani
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Michael J. Gordon, Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>On May 29, 2014, an employee of the Department of Public Health made a left-hand turn from a stop sign on Stunt Road at its intersection with Mulholland Highway in front of Plaintiff, who was travelling northbound on Mulholland Highway with the right-of-way, causing a collision. Plaintiff claims he sustained a concussion and broke his right hand during the collision. He also claims property damage.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$30,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 79,278
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 18,646

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Ernesto Pena Jr., et al. v. Marie Girolamo, et al.
CASE NUMBER	BC 568400
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	January 2, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Public Defender
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 489,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Paul W. Wong, Esquire Law Offices of Paul W. Wong
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Millicent L. Rolon Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$489,500 a lawsuit filed by Ernesto Pena Jr., by and through his guardian ad litem Emiliano Pena, against the County and Deputy Public Defender Marie Girolamo, alleging legal malpractice and breach of fiduciary duty.</p> <p>Because of 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 \$489,500 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 88,005
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 31,731

Case Name: Emiliano Pena as guardian ad litem for Ernesto Pena, Jr. v. Marie Girolamo and County of Los Angeles



## 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:	October 11, 1995
Briefly provide a description of the Incident/event:	Public Defender client Ernesto Pena accepted a plea bargain on October 11, 1995 for a reduced charge. The reduced charge was added to the list of crimes requiring sex registration effective January 1, 1996. On January 2, 2014, the Public Defender's office made, and the Superior Court granted, a motion to dismiss pursuant to Penal Code §1203.4 and a Petition for Certification of Rehabilitation and Pardon per Penal Code §4852.13. On January 31, 2014, the Public Defender's office made and the Superior Court granted a Motion to Withdraw the Plea pursuant to Penal Code §1018, and the case was ordered dismissed per Penal Code §1385. Thereafter, on May 19, 2014, the Public Defender's office appeared for a Petition for a finding of factual innocence which was granted per Penal Code §851.8. On January 2, 2015, plaintiff filed the Instant lawsuit.

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

In 2014, the Public Defender's Office filed papers in the best interests of the client, however managerial approval/review was not required/conducted.

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

The Public Defender's Office will require managerial approval prior to filing a motion for declaration of actual innocence. Furthermore, the Public Defender's Office will provide additional training to staff on

matters where declaring a conflict is at issue.

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) <i>Bryce M. Tyler</i>	
Signature: <i>Bryce M. Tyler</i>	Date: <i>3.2.17</i>

Name: (Department Head) <i>Kelly G. Embling</i>	
Signature: <i>Kelly G. Embling</i>	Date: <i>3/2/17</i>

<b>Chief Executive Office Risk Management Inspector General USE ONLY</b>	
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) <i>Destiny Castro</i>	
Signature: <i>Destiny Castro</i>	Date: <i>2/22/2017</i>

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	N.L.A., et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	CV 15-02431
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	April 2, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 2,970,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	John Burton, Esq. Law Offices of John Burton  Humberto Guizar, Esq. Guizar, Henderson & Carrazco, LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jonathan McCaverty Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$2,970,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights and State-law wrongful death lawsuit filed by Elvia Aguilar, the mother of decedent Noel Aguilar, and Mr. Aguilar's minor children, N.L.A. and C.M.G.</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 \$2,970,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 224,612
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 31,228



Case Name: N.L.A. 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 26, 2014
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p><b><u>N.L.A. v. County of Los Angeles</u></b> Summary Corrective Action Plan 2017-003</p> <p>On May 26, 2014, at approximately 9:45 a.m., two uniformed Los Angeles County deputy sheriffs assigned to Compton Station were on patrol in an unincorporated area of Compton. The deputies observed a bicyclist (later identified as decedent) riding his bicycle on the sidewalk and wearing earphones.</p> <p>When the decedent saw the deputies' patrol vehicle, he started peddling faster eastbound onto East 69<sup>th</sup> Way from northbound Long Beach Boulevard and the deputies followed.</p> <p>After travelling a short distance, the decedent jumped off his bicycle and ran northbound in an alleyway between apartment buildings. The passenger deputy chased after the decedent. The driver advised the passenger deputy that the decedent may be armed because he was holding his waist area with one hand as he ran.</p> <p>The driver deputy exited the patrol vehicle and ran northbound in a parallel alley, just east of where the decedent and passenger deputy were running. As he ran northbound in the adjacent alleyway, the driver deputy observed the decedent using both his hands to push open an iron gate separating the two alleyways. The driver deputy drew his duty weapon and commanded the decedent to stop. Rather than complying, the decedent held his waist area with his hands and continued running northbound. At that point, the driver deputy tripped and fell over uneven ground. The decedent continued to run and the passenger deputy continued to follow him. The driver deputy re-holstered his weapon and followed the pair.</p> <p>The decedent suddenly stopped adjacent to another iron gate and the passenger deputy caught, tackled, and forced the decedent to the ground.</p> <p>The driver deputy arrived seconds later and realized the decedent was violently struggling with the passenger deputy. The driver deputy used his left arm to hold down the decedent's right shoulder and used his left knee to hold the decedent's right arm.</p> <p>The passenger deputy observed the decedent's hands were underneath his body. Fearing the decedent was attempting to retrieve a weapon, and in an attempt to control the decedent, the passenger deputy struck the decedent on his right elbow four times with the handle portion of his expandable baton.</p>

While struggling to control the decedent's hands, the passenger deputy discovered the decedent's right hand was on a pistol that was concealed under his clothes in his waistband. The passenger deputy advised his partner that the decedent had a gun. The passenger deputy reached into the decedent's waistband, recovered a pistol<sup>1</sup>, and then placed it into his own front waistband.

**Note:** The passenger deputy sheriff did not advise the driver deputy sheriff that he had recovered the decedent's firearm.

Because the decedent continued to struggle with both deputy sheriffs and he continued to move his hands into his waist area, the driver deputy feared the decedent may still be armed and was attempting to retrieve a weapon. The driver deputy drew his duty weapon and pointed it at the decedent's head while ordering the decedent to not move.

The passenger deputy handcuffed the decedent's left wrist but could not maintain control of his arm. Seconds later, the decedent violently increased his resistance and used both of his hands to push himself up then again reached for his waistband. At that point, the driver deputy believed the decedent was reaching for a gun and was about to shoot. The driver deputy aimed his duty weapon at the decedent's abdomen and fired. The driver deputy shot one round and attempted to fire two additional rounds, but his duty weapon jammed and would not continue to fire.

Immediately after the gunshot, the passenger deputy screamed "I've been shot<sup>2</sup>." The driver deputy asked the passenger deputy, "Did he shoot you?" referring to the decedent.

The decedent grabbed the driver deputy's duty weapon and attempted to take it away. The driver deputy struggled with the decedent over possession of his duty weapon. The driver deputy was able to maintain primary control of his duty weapon, cleared the malfunction (by "racking a round"), and fired one round at close range striking the decedent in the leg. Although shot, the decedent continued to violently struggle with the deputies.

The passenger deputy believed that the decedent was the person responsible for shooting him, even after he had taken one gun away from him. The passenger deputy knew that the driver deputy and the decedent had been fighting over possession of the driver deputy's duty weapon. The passenger deputy feared that the decedent either had a second gun or had retained the driver deputy's duty weapon. The passenger deputy knew that he was injured from a gunshot wound and felt he may not be able to fight much longer. Based on the above, the passenger deputy feared the decedent was a deadly threat to him and his partner. To stop the decedent's deadly threat, the passenger deputy fired three rounds at point blank range into the decedent's back.

The driver deputy broadcast emergency radio traffic that a deputy involved shooting had occurred and requested paramedics. Several

---

<sup>1</sup> The pistol was a loaded "Taurus PT745 Pro Millennium", .45 caliber with six live, .45 caliber bullets. The pistol was concealed underneath the decedent's clothes and held in place by a green nylon web belt. The belt was not attached to the decedent's clothes or any other items and its only apparent function was to hold the pistol.

<sup>2</sup> It was later discovered that the driver deputy's fired round missed the decedent and struck the passenger deputy.

	<p>patrol deputies arrived on scene. Emergency medical personnel arrived on scene. The decedent was not transported to the hospital as he was pronounced dead at the scene. Both deputy sheriffs were transported to Saint Francis Hospital for medical treatment.</p> <p>The passenger deputy sustained a single gunshot wound to his abdomen that struck the space above his gun belt but below his body armor. The driver deputy was treated for abrasions, scrapes and bruises to his hands and arms.</p>
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the deputies' decision to engage in a foot pursuit of a suspected armed suspect (later found to be armed with a firearm) without proper planning or communication amongst themselves, which ultimately led to the deadly force situation.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was the deputy sheriffs' decision to partner split during the foot pursuit.

Another **Department** root cause in this incident was a field training officer's failure to safely manage his actions and the actions of his trainee, resulting in the serious injury of the trainee.

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 orders, the decedent fled from deputies on foot. He was captured, a struggle ensued and the decedent attempted to grab a gun from one of the deputy sheriffs. The decedent's actions caused the deputies to fear for their lives, resulting in a deputy involved shooting.

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 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Homicide Bureau to determine if any criminal misconduct occurred.

On February 23, 2015, the Justice System Integrity Division of the District Attorney's Office issued a use-of-force determination letter concluding that both deputies acted lawfully in self-defense during the May 26, 2014 incident and that the District Attorney's Office will not be taking any further action relating to this incident.

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

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:

5-9-17

Name: (Department Head)

Karyn Mannis, Chief  
Professional Standards and Training Division

Signature:

Karyn Mannis

Date:

05-15-17

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:



Date:

5/15/2017

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Claim of Tenaya Brown
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 45,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	In Propria Persona
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Jennifer A.D. Lehman Assistant County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$45,000 a slander and negligence government tort claim filed with the County by Sheriff's Sergeant Tenaya Brown. In the claim, Sergeant Brown alleges that various members of the Sheriff's Department circulated false rumors about her, which caused her ongoing humiliation, mental and physical distress, and irreparable harm to her reputation.</p> <p>Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. Therefore, a full and final settlement of the claim in the amount of \$45,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0

## CASE SUMMARY

### INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Non-Litigated Claim of Humberto Cortez
CASE NUMBER	N/A
COURT	N/A
DATE FILED	November 9, 2015
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Fire Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 30,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	N/A
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Kevin J. Engelen Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This claim arises from an automobile versus motorcycle collision between claimant Humberto Cortez and an on-duty Los Angeles County Fire Fighter on November 9, 2015 on State Route 2. The collision occurred when the Fire Fighter abruptly veered the County vehicle to the right and collided with Mr. Cortez. Mr. Cortez was ejected from his motorcycle and suffered bodily injuries as a result of the collision.</p> <p>Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full settlement of the claim is warranted.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 0

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

**MAY 15, 2017**

**1. Call to Order.**

This meeting of the County of Los Angeles Claims Board was called to order at 9:30 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: Richard Kudo, Jessica Rivas, and Jenny Tam; Fire Department: Anthony Marrone, Cynthia Maluto, and Julia Bennett; Sheriff's Department: Judy Gerhardt, Carlos Parga, Kevin Percy, and Dominic Dannan; Department of Public Social Services: Arnetta Counts and Simone Agee; Internal Services Department: Mark Colton and Erin Campos.

**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.**

One member 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 9:32 a.m., the Chairperson adjourned the meeting into Closed Session to discuss the items listed as 4(a) through 4(f) below.

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

At 10:13 a.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session and reported the actions taken in Closed Session as follows:

**a. Lillian Garcia, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 561 344**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained when Plaintiff was hit by a Fire Department Lifeguard's vehicle.

**Action Taken:**

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$225,000.

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

**b. Benjamin Nicholas, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 575 312**

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$23,233.44.

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

**c. Raquel Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles , et al.  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 603 094**

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$27,000.

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

**d. Jonathan Hatter v. County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 574 671**

This dangerous condition lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff received from a fall while at the lobby of a Department of Public Social Services' office.

Action Taken:

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

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

**e. Ghislaine Couchman v. County of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 591 734**

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff sustained when she tripped and fell on concrete rubble and debris in the parking lot at Harbor/UCLA Medical Center.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the settlement of this matter in the amount of \$60,000.

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



f. **Moises A. Sandoval and Martha A. Sandoval v. County of Los Angeles and Richard Hugues**  
**Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 602 093**

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained in a vehicle accident involving an employee from the Internal Services Department.

Action Taken:

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

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

5. **Approval of the minutes of the May 1, 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 10:14 a.m.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CLAIMS BOARD

By   
Sandra C. Ruiz