STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

HELD IN PERSON AND ONLINE VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

ON MONDAY, JUNE 2, 2025, AT 9:30 A.M.

Present: Chair Destiny Castro, and Adrienne M. Byers

Absent: Oscar Valdez

1. Call to Order.

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

No member of the public appeared in person or on the public teleconference phone line to address the Claims Board.

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

a. Sharon L. Anderson v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV34038

This lawsuit concerns allegations of sexual assault and battery by a Department of Mental Health employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 3(a) to a future meeting.

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

b. Gariel Brownlee v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
United States District Court No. 2:21-cv-01118

This federal civil rights lawsuit concerns allegations of delay in treatment while in custody and negligent surgery by the Los Angeles General Medical Center resulting in Plaintiff's partial paralysis.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(b) in the amount of $7,000,000.

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

See Supporting Documents

c. **Vindi Figueroa v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23CMCV01817

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained from a fall that occurred in an unincorporated area of Los Angeles.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(c) in the amount of $25,000 for economic reasons only.

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

See Supporting Document

d. **Dawn Roberts v. City of Santa Clarita, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23CHCV03841

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained when she tripped and fell over a piece of metal protruding from the sidewalk.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(d) in the amount of $50,000.

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

See Supporting Document

e. **Yoni Muzan v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23VECV01188

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Department of Public Work's employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(e) in the amount of $52,500.

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

See Supporting Document

f. **Non-Litigated Claims of Lynn and Michael Tigar**

These inverse condemnation claims against the Department of Public Works contend that a residential property was damaged due to backflow of sewage from a sewer mainline blockage.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(f) in the amount of $278,526.34.

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

See Supporting Document

g. **Fiona Pescoran v. Veronica Yvonne Rivas, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV25764

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(g) in the amount of $95,000.

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

See Supporting Document

h. **Alexander Torres v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:22-cv-07450

This federal civil rights lawsuit against the Sheriff's Department and District Attorney's Office arises from the alleged wrongful conviction that resulted in Plaintiff's imprisonment for 20 years.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(h) in the amount of $14,000,000.

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

See Supporting Documents

i. **Deborah Tolbert v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC698440

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 3(i) to a future meeting.

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

j. **Jessica Gonzalez v. Los Angeles County Dept. of Children and Family Svcs, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV20401

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee from the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to sexual harassment.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(j) in the amount of $85,000.

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

k. **Valerie Busch v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV27869

This lawsuit alleges that an employee from the Department of Children and Family Services was subjected to disability discrimination and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(k) in the amount of $175,000.

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

4. Approval of the Minutes of the May 5, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the May 5, 2025, meeting.

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

See Supporting Document

5. 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 an 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.

6. Adjournment.

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Gariel Brownlee v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		2:21-cv-01118
COURT		United States District Court, Central District of California
DATE FILED		February 8, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Health Services/Correctional Health Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	7 million
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Kevin S. Conlogue Conlogue Law, LLP Thomas S. Feher Feher Law, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Caroline S. Craddock Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $7 million, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by former inmate Gariel Brownlee. Plaintiff contends that a medical procedure resulted in partial paralysis. Due to the uncertainties of trial, the settlement is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	300,041.50
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	300,819.41

Case Name: Brownlee, Gariel #6208

Summary Corrective Action Plan

The intent of this form is to assist departments in writing a corrective action plan summary fo 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:	December 4, 2019
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	This is a recommendation to settle for $7 million, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit filed by former inmate G.B. Plaintiff contends that a medical procedure resulted in partial paralysis. Due to the uncertainties of trial, the settlement is recommended.

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

Partial paralysis resulting from an embolization procedure to treat an arteriovenous malformation.

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

- The facility employed a new Neurosurgery attending physician.
- The Chief Medical Officer discussed the event reporting system with specialty Chief Physicians on May 2, 2025.

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) Arun Patel, MD, JD	
Signature:	Date: 05/15/2025

Name: (Department Head) Christina Ghaly, MD	
Signature:	Date: 5/20/25

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) Betty Karmirlian	
Signature: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 5/20/2025

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Vindi Figueroa v. City of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23CMCV01817
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		November 13, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	25,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		SCARLETT FARROKH, ESQ. Sammy Wess & Scarlett Farrokh
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		KEVIN ENGELIEN Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This incident occurred on March 2, 2023. Plaintiff, Vindi Figueroa, alleges she was walking onto the sidewalk at the North-East corner of South Broadway and El Segundo Boulevard when she slipped on broken glass and fell.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	4,608
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	9,558

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Dawn Roberts v. City of Santa Clarita, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23CHCV03841
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		December 18, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	50,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		NATALEE FISHER, ESQ. Dordulian Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MELISSA A. MCCAVERTY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		On November 4, 2022, Plaintiff was on a run on the sidewalk of Henry Mayo Drive heading northeast heading towards Commerce Center Drive in Santa Clarita, California, when she tripped on a protruding metal stump in the sidewalk. Plaintiff claims to have suffered injuries and damages from the incident. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	16,983
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	961

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Yoni Muzan vs. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23VECV01188
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		March 17, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	52,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		JOSEPH Y. AVRAHAMY, ESQ. Law Offices of Joseph Y. Avrahamy
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		MELISSA A. MCCAVERTY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This lawsuit arises from a motor vehicle collision that occurred on June 14, 2022, eastbound on the 101 freeway, when a Department of Public Works vehicle collided into Plaintiff's vehicle causing injuries and damages. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	27,286
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	9,588

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Non-Litigated Claims of Lynn and Michael Tigar
CASE NUMBER		N/A
COURT		N/A
DATE FILED		N/A
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Department of Public Works
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	$278,526.34
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		N/A
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Edwin A. Lewis Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This claim arises from a sewer mainline blockage that caused a sewer backflow onto the Claimants' property and damaged their real and personal property. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full settlement of the claim is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	0
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	0

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Pescoran, Fiona vs. Rivas, Veronica Yvonne, et al.
CASE NUMBER		23STCV25764
COURT		Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED		November 21, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	95,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		VICTOR ALEXANDROFF, Esq. Alexandroff Law Group
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		SANJAY ATHALYE Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		On June 15, 2022, Plaintiff was traveling northbound on Fraser Avenue intersection with Whittier Boulevard, when she stopped to make a right turn to assess the traffic and was rear-ended by Deputy Rivas. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	19,658
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	4,326

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME		Alexander Torres v. County of Los Angeles, et al
CASE NUMBER		2:22-CV-07450
COURT		United States District Court
DATE FILED		November 1, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT		Sheriff's & District Attorney
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	$	14,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF		Loevy & Loevy
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY		Minas Samuelian Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE		This is a recommendation to settle for $14,000,000 inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a lawsuit filed by Alexander Torres, for his alleged wrongful conviction. 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 $14,000,000 is recommended.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	$	553,727
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	$	169,095

Case Name: Alexander Torres 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:	December 31, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	Summary Corrective Action Plan 2024-206 Based on multiple investigative reports, on Sunday, December 31, 2000, at approximately 7:19 p.m., the Decedent and Witness One were riding their bicycles northbound. As they were riding their bicycles, a late model, blue vehicle, traveling north on the same street, pulled up alongside them. The suspect exited the passenger side door of the blue vehicle and confronted the Decedent. The suspect asked the Decedent if he was "Casper" several times. The Decedent informed the suspect he was not "Casper." The suspect then began shooting at the Decedent. The Decedent attempted to run from the suspect but collapsed in a residential yard on the west side of the street. The suspect re-entered the blue vehicle and traveled down the street and out of view. Los Angeles County Fire Rescue responded and transported the Decedent to a Medical Center, where he was pronounced deceased. Homicide Investigators were dispatched to the crime scene on the night of the shooting and assumed investigative responsibility for the murder of the Decedent. Witness One stated that the Decedent was from a gang. He informed the Investigators the Decedent told him a male from a different gang wanted to kill him three days prior to the murder. The Plaintiff was identified as a suspect, primarily based on testimonies from key eyewitnesses, including Witnesses One and Two, who had conflicting accounts and identifications as to who the shooter was. These identifications were later disputed. The Plaintiff was arrested on January 18, 2001, after a series of interrogations by Homicide Investigators, a failed

	polygraph test, and the Plaintiff's inability to provide a consistent alibi. The Plaintiff was found guilty of second-degree murder on June 12, 2001, for the murder of the Decedent. He was sentenced to 40 years to life in state prison. Years later, new information emerged which alleged a third party, not the Plaintiff, might have been responsible for the murder. This led to the Plaintiff's exoneration on October 19, 2021, when the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office and the Plaintiff filed a Joint Motion for a Finding of Factual Innocence. The petition was granted, and the Plaintiff's conviction was vacated. Below are the key and critical issues identified during the investigation. A key eyewitness provided conflicting statements during the investigation which raised questions about the reliability of his testimony. It was alleged that the Homicide Investigator's methods of conducting photo arrays with witnesses of the Plaintiff were deemed to be suggestive. The Homicide Investigators did not properly separate witnesses during their respective interviews during the identification process, allowing for potential influence between witnesses. It was alleged that the Homicide Investigators ignored critical details in their reports regarding eyewitness testimonies. It was alleged that the Homicide Investigators failed to disclose potentially exculpatory evidence that could have supported the Plaintiff's defense. It was also alleged that the Homicide Investigators' notebooks contained information about potential alternative suspects and omitted evidence which related to Witness One's misidentification of a purported driver of the getaway car. Homicide Investigators One and Two testified during their depositions that it was their practice to turn over their notebooks to the prosecutor and defense counsel. The former Deputy District Attorney who prosecuted the case, testified that he would have turned over to the defense all files and notebooks provided to him.

	However, neither the District Attorney's file nor the LASD records contain proof that the disputed files and documents were turned over. It was alleged that Homicide Investigators One and Two ignored new information after the conviction of the Plaintiff that pointed to another suspect. The new information pointed to a third party as the actual shooter. This information was provided to a private investigator hired by the Plaintiff's brother. However, during the deposition, the Plaintiff's brother testified that the private investigator was not told the alleged third party was the shooter.

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

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Homicide Investigators' alleged misrepresentation of statements made by witnesses in their supplemental reports.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the improper identification procedures conducted by both Homicide Investigators.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the inability of current Homicide Investigators to confirm whether exculpatory evidence, such as files related to potential suspects, detectives' notebooks, and recordings of witness interviews, was ever disclosed to the District Attorney's Office during the initial court proceedings. Due to the absence of clear records, investigators were unable to definitively determine if this material had been turned over or withheld.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Homicide Investigators' failure to follow proper investigative protocols regarding evidence and witness interviews.

A **Department** root cause in this incident was the Homicide Investigators' failure to investigate information regarding alternative suspects.

A **non-Department** root cause in this incident was Witness One's failure to be forthcoming with the Homicide Investigators when he was first interviewed.

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

Policies Related to Investigations

Multiple policies have since been published which address the following topics: Suspect identification procedures, responsibility for documentation, recording admonishment to witness arrays, retention of "raw" victim/witness interview notes and recordings. New and revised policies are briefed to Department personnel.

Additionally, Homicide Bureau utilizes Evidence.com to store and provide discovery to the district attorney's office. Evidence.com has been in use since 2020.
As an added layer of oversight, Homicide Bureau is currently in the process of creating a checklist to memorialize and standardize all homicide discovery evidence shared with the District Attorney's Office.

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. Valdes, Acting Captain Risk Management Bureau	
Signature:	Date: 5/14/25

Name: (Department Head) Jason A. Skeen, Assistant Sheriff Countywide Operations	
Signature:	Date: 5/21/25

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: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)	
Signature: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 5/21/2025

Case Name: *Alexander Torres 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:	2000 to 2021
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	In 2021, following a thorough investigation, Plaintiff and the Los Angeles District Attorney's Conviction Integrity Unit jointly filed a habeas corpus petition to vacate Plaintiff's murder conviction. On October 19, 2021, the court ruled that the new evidence undermined the prosecution's case and strongly supported Plaintiff's innocence, leading to his release from state prison that same day. The District Attorney's Office chose not to re-prosecute. Based on the preponderance of evidence, a motion was filed under section 1485.55(b) requesting the court to issue a finding of factual innocence.

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

The corrective action plan addresses several root causes related to documentation, staffing, and communication. First, there was a lack of adequate records documenting what evidence was provided to the defense and what was received by law enforcement, leading to gaps in the evidentiary chain. Additionally, delays in case review were attributed to insufficient staffing and the high volume of referrals within the Conviction Review Unit. Lastly, the language used in the Joint Motion for a Finding of Factual Innocence deviated from standard phrasing, which implied that the prosecution was unwarranted.

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

A) Lack of records to show what evidence was produced to the defense.

It is essential to maintain a detailed log of all evidence shared with defense counsel, ensuring it is appropriately documented and retained in the file. While the approach to discovery may vary by case, the department will provide training on Bates stamping discovery materials, requiring signed proof of discovery for discovery turned over subsequent to fling and/or put the disclosure of discovery on the record in open court and will emphasize the importance of keeping accurate records of all evidence provided to the defense.

B) Lack of records to show what evidence was received by law enforcement.

Maintaining a comprehensive log of all evidence received from law enforcement agencies is essential, and we must periodically compare this log with the records from law enforcement to ensure accuracy. Since 2020, nearly all law enforcement agencies in Los Angeles County use Evidence.com, which stores and tracks digital evidence. This system makes digital evidence tracking highly accurate. An audit trail is created that shows when evidence was uploaded or accessed. In addition, DDAs need to fully document all actions, including discovery, in a case in the confidential "Attorney Notes" section of case files.

C) Delay in reviewing the case caused by staffing numbers within the Conviction Review Unit (CRU) and the vast number of referrals that need to be screened.

In 2017, the Conviction Review Unit was staffed by only a few Deputy District Attorneys (DDAs), yet they received a large volume of submissions. Although many of these cases would prove to be meritless, thousands of pages, trial transcripts, audio and video evidence needs to be reviewed before coming to that conclusion. Cases were addressed in the order that investigators and attorneys became available. Plaintiff's case was not assigned to a DDA until June 2020.

It is important to note that the Conviction Review Unit (CRU) is not statutorily mandated but created at the will of the District Attorney. The work is important but when the office is unable to fulfill its core mission because of staffing shortages, the office cannot spare attorneys to work within the unit. The unit currently has more attorneys and investigators than many special units within the office. In spite of this, staffing of both attorneys and investigators has increased since 2017.

D) The language in the Joint Motion for a Finding of Factual Innocence deviated from standard phrasing and implied that the prosecution against Plaintiff was unwarranted.

A critical part of the LADA mission is ensuring the integrity of criminal convictions. The LADA has a comprehensive post-conviction review policy and commits significant resources to reviewing criminal convictions. The LADA's Office has multiple divisions/units dedicated to post conviction review. These include Post-Conviction Review and Discovery under which falls the Resentencing unit and the Murder Resentencing unit, Writs and Appeals Division and the Conviction Review Unit. The mission of the office is to ensure the integrity of convictions and to review cases to ensure that the defendant had a fair trial and that defendants eligible for relief from a change in the law receive that relief.

The Chief Deputy for the prior administration's letter to the court without CRU approval regarding allowing Plaintiff to be released prior to the final determination was unorthodox but not in violation of office policy. The verbiage used in the joint stipulation was misleading as phrased and not standard language. All future motions from CRU will require review by County Counsel and approval from the District Attorney. Motions submitted to the District Attorney for approval

typically require prior approval from a Head Deputy, Bureau Director, and Assistant District Attorney. This practice is now standard under the new administration.

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

X Yes – The corrective actions address department-wide system issues.

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

Name: (Risk Management Coordinator) **Julie Dixon Silva**	
Signature:	Date: 05/19/2025
Name: (Department Head)	
Signature:	Date: 5/20/2025

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) Betty Karmirlian	
Signature: Betty Karmirlian	Date: 5/20/25

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

May 5, 2025

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:41 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: Heidi Liu, Michael Simon, Michael Gordon, Keever Rhodes Muir, Millicent Rolon, Jonathan McCaverty, Victoria Jalili, Vanessa A. Evangelista, Anthony F. Morrone, and Eduardo Montelongo appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Rosimar Viera Hernandez, Brian Mejia, Kevin Regan, Michelle O'Connor, Anush Gambaryan, and Sean Woods appeared for the Department of Parks and Recreation. Jacklin Injijian and Mary Reyes appeared for the Department of Public Works. Commander Johann W. Thrall, Sergeant Shanese E. Winfrey, Deputy Nancy K. Madarasz, Commander Christine M. Coles, Lieutenant Juan F. Sanchez, Lieutenant Francois H. Chang, Commander Damon A. Jones, and Captain Richard B. Conti appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Deanna Carlisle appeared for the Probation Department. Robert Myrtle appeared for the Department of Health Services. Tim Pescatello appeared for the District Attorney's Office. Justin Kimura and Simone Agee appeared for Department of Public Social Services. Brian Martin and Julia Kim appeared for the Fire Department. Adam A. Ainslie and Tomas Guterres appeared for Collins + Collins LLP. Thomas Hurrell appeared for Hurrell Cantrall LLP. Andrew Baum appeared for Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan & Shapiro LLP. Renee Brown and Michele Goldsmith appeared for BDG Law Group. Geoffrey S. Sheldon appeared for Liebert Cassidy & Whitmore.

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 member of the public appeared in person or on the public teleconference phone line to address the Claims Board.

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

At 9:42 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro, convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(j).

4. Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

No member of the public appeared in person or on the public teleconference phone line to address the Claims Board.

At 12:51 p.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session to report the actions taken in closed session as follows:

a. <u>Parks and Recreation's Castaic Lake facilities Cal/OSHA Inspection</u>
Citation No. 1383344

This citation issued by Cal/OSHA against the Department of Parks and Recreation concerns allegations of several violations at Castaic Lake.

<u>Action Taken</u>:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(a) in the amount of $24,940.

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

b. **Stephen Hernandez, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV18272

This dangerous condition of public property lawsuit alleges that County property caused the bicycle accident that led to Decedent's death.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(b) in the amount of $1,250,000.

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

c. **Josue Ruiz Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23AVCV00444

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries Plaintiff sustained in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(c) in the amount of $80,000.

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

d. **WenHui Chen, et al. v. Lane C. St. John, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV25304

This lawsuit arises from alleged injuries sustained by Plaintiffs in a traffic collision involving a Sheriff's Department deputy.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board *did not* recommend to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(d) in the amount of $950,000.

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

e. **Adrian Romero v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:23-cv-02025

This federal civil rights lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff was shot by Sheriff's Department's deputies.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(e) in the amount of $450,000.

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

f. **LL John Doe MB v. Defendant Doe School District, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV39133

This lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff was sexually assaulted by a former deputy probation officer assigned to a high school operated by LAUSD.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(f) in the amount of $350,000.

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

g. **Romelia Valenzuela v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV13994

This lawsuit alleges that an employee with the Department of Health Services was subjected to discrimination and retaliation based on disability and age.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(g) in the amount of $40,000.

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

h. **Edward Kyle v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV30322

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(h) in the amount of $50,000.

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

i. **Sandra Lainez v. Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV36024

This lawsuit alleges that an employee from the Department of Public Social Services was subjected to disability discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(i) in the amount of $75,000.

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

j. **Anderson Mackey v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23STCV04175

This lawsuit alleges that an employee from the Fire Department was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on race and disability.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(j) in the amount of $579,000.

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

5. Approval of the Minutes of the April 21, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the April 21, 2025, meeting.

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

6. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:53 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By Laura Salazar
Laura Z. Salazar
Claims Board Secretary