

STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD
HELD IN PERSON AND ONLINE VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2025, AT 9:30 A.M.

Present: Chair Destiny Castro, Adrienne M. Byers, and 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. **Renee Lemos, et al. v. Los Angeles Unified School District, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV01719**

This medical malpractice lawsuit alleges that Olive View Medical Center staff were negligent, which caused or contributed to injuries suffered by a minor.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(a) in the amount of \$4,000,000.

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

[See Supporting Document](#)

- b. **Jose Gaitan v. Steven Martinez, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV36900**

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(b) in the amount of \$450,000.

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

[See Supporting Documents](#)

c. **Estate of Nicholas Burgos, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:21-cv-05566

This federal civil rights lawsuit arises from a Sheriff's Department deputy's use of deadly force during an encounter with Nicholas Burgos at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(c) in the amount of \$1,100,000 for economic reasons only.

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

[See Supporting Document](#)

d. **Kamryn Garbutt v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:24-cv-10947

This federal civil rights lawsuit alleges that Plaintiff was assaulted by a probation officer and subsequently missed a court appearance, resulting in his over-detention.

Action Taken:

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

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

[See Supporting Documents](#)

e. **Maria Evila Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWCV00478

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving an employee of the Internal Services Department.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 3(e) in the amount of \$45,500.

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

[See Supporting Document](#)

[Remainder of page intentionally left blank.]

**f. XJ Grand Hotel LLC v. County of Los Angeles
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV09617**

This lawsuit seeks compensation for property damages allegedly caused by occupants participating in a temporary County housing program.

Action Taken:

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

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

[See Supporting Document](#)

**g. Erwin Mandani v. LAC+USC Medical Center, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV40257**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that the Department of Health Services failed to engage in the interactive process or provide reasonable accommodation to a former employee with a disability.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(g) in the amount of \$230,000.

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

**h. Jon Hatami v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV32870**

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to discrimination based on race and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 3(h) in the amount of \$1,500,000.

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

4. Approval of the Minutes of the November 17, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the November 17, 2025, meeting.

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

[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	Renee Lemos, et al. vs. Los Angeles Unified School District, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV01719
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Courtt
DATE FILED	January 15, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Department of Health Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 4,000,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Chivinski Law Firm, APC
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	NARBEH BAGDASARIAN Principal Deputy County Counsel Health Services Division
NATURE OF CASE	<p>December 15, 2019, C. Lopez Jr., a minor, was brought to Olive View Medical Center (OVMC) after experiencing illness for three days. Through his Guardian-ad-Litem, C. Lopez Jr. filed a medical malpractice lawsuit against the County of Los Angeles alleging that OVMC staff failed to adequately treat his injuries.</p> <p>Due to high risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 245,034
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 221,476

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Jose Gaitan vs. Steven Martinez, et al.
CASE NUMBER	21STCV36900
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	October 6, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 450,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	ERIC S. CHUN, ESQ.. Avrek Law Firm
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	KEVIN ENGELIEN, ESQ.. Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	This is an auto-liability lawsuit which arises from a traffic collision that occurred on November 1, 2020. Plaintiff claims he suffered injuries and damages as a result of the collision. Due to the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a full and final settlement of the case is warranted.
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 181,082
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 56,390



Summary Corrective Action Plan

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

Date of incident/event:	November 1, 2020
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p align="center">Summary Corrective Action Plan 2025-253</p> <p>Details in this document summarize the incident. The information provided is a culmination of various sources to provide an abstract of the incident.</p> <p>Multiple investigative reports indicate, on Sunday, November 1, 2020, at approximately 2321 hours, Deputy One (driver), assigned to patrol, along with his partner (passenger), were in a marked black and white patrol vehicle responding with emergency lights and siren (Code-3) to an assistance request by station personnel.</p> <p>During the emergency response, Deputy One drove the patrol vehicle northbound on a boulevard, in the #1 lane, approaching the next boulevard. The traffic light at the boulevard phased red as they approached the intersection. Deputy One slowed the patrol vehicle down and attempted to visually clear the lanes of traffic before entering the intersection against a red light. The deputies saw a second patrol unit, which was stopped at the boulevard in the westbound lanes of the intersection, blocking westbound traffic. As Deputy One proceeded northbound through the intersection, the patrol vehicle was struck by the Plaintiff's vehicle, which was traveling eastbound on the opposite boulevard in the #1 lane.</p> <p>California Highway Patrol responded to the scene and investigated the traffic collision. At the time of the investigation, there were no reported injuries by the Plaintiff or deputy personnel and the property damage to the patrol vehicle and civilian vehicle was considered minor. The investigating officer determined the Plaintiff caused the collision by failing to yield to the right of way of an emergency vehicle, violation of California Vehicle Code Section 21806(a)(1).</p>

	<p>A forensic data download was later obtained from the patrol vehicle involved in the traffic collision, which confirmed the emergency lights and siren were activated at the time of the collision. The data also showed that Deputy One traveled up to 83mph before he began to slow during his approach to the intersection. He was traveling at around 36mph as he reached the intersection and slowed the patrol vehicle to about 15mph at the time of the collision.</p>
--	---

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

A **Department** root cause of this incident was Deputy One's failure to properly clear the intersection resulting in a traffic collision with the Plaintiff's vehicle.

A **non-Department** root cause was the Plaintiff's failure to yield to the right of way of an emergency vehicle.

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

Traffic Collision Investigation

California Highway Patrol responded to the scene and conducted a traffic collision investigation. The collision investigation concluded the Plaintiff caused the collision by failing to yield to the right of way of an emergency vehicle, violation of California Vehicle Code Section 21806(a)(1).

Administrative Review of Traffic Collision

All traffic collisions involving a Department member are investigated by a supervisor. A patrol sergeant responded to the scene of the traffic collision and completed a Supervisor's Report (SH-R-257), which included the findings of the California Highway Patrol's investigation. The Supervisor's Report was submitted for approval by the watch commander, unit commander, and division commander. Based on the totality of the circumstances, this traffic collision was classified as "non-preventable". No driving points were assessed to Deputy One's Department driving record.

Traffic Collision Assessment Review

An assessment of employee involved traffic collisions at East Los Angeles Station was conducted from January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2024.

The audit revealed both preventable and non-preventable traffic collisions have decreased since 2021 according to the following chart:

Calendar Year	Preventable Collisions	Non-Preventable Collisions
2021	26	22
2022	24	13
2023	20	14
2024	15	10

In an effort to improve employee safety and reduce the Department's liability exposure, the station supervision continually brief station personnel regarding the importance of safe driving procedures, including Code-3 emergency responses. The Captain has met with station supervisors to ensure they understand their responsibility to monitor safe driving practices, and has met with newly assigned personnel, who have completed the patrol training program, to discuss safe driving expectations.

Sheriff Department Announcement - Department-Wide Rebrief:

The purpose of this re-brief is to remind Department personnel that the safety of Department members and the public is paramount when engaged in routine driving and Code-3 responses.

Department-Wide Broadcast Announcements – Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC):

In an effort to mitigate Department traffic collisions, Risk Management Bureau has partnered with the Sheriff's Communication Center (SCC) to create Department-Wide announcements.

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)

Tri Hoang, Captain
Risk Management Bureau

Signature:



Date:

10.17.25

Name: (Department Head)

Yolanda R. Figueroa, Chief
Central Patrol Division

Signature:



Date:

10/21/2025

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: Betty Karmirlian (Risk Management Inspector General)

Signature:



Date:

10/22/25

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Estate of Nicholas Burgos v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:21-CV-05566-FMO-GJSx
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	July 9, 2021
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Sheriff's Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$1,100,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Arnoldo Casillas, Esq.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Timothy J. Kral Principal Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$1,100,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs, a federal civil rights lawsuit brought by the Estate of Nicholas Burgos and his minor son, J.N.B., arising from a deputy's use of deadly force during an encounter with Mr. Burgos at Harbor-UCLA Medical Center on October 6, 2020.</p> <p>Given the risks and uncertainties of litigation, a reasonable settlement at this time will avoid further litigation costs. The full and final settlement of the case in the amount of \$1,100,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 278,895
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 100,374

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Kamryn Garbutt v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	2:24-CV-10947-WLH (BFMx)
COURT	United States District Court
DATE FILED	December 19, 2024
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Los Angeles Probation Department
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 400,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	ERIN DARLING Law Offices of Erin Darling
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	ANNA REITANO Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>ANDREW BAUM Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan & Shapiro LLP</p> <p>This is a recommendation to settle the federal civil rights lawsuit filed by Kamryn Garbutt arising out of an alleged assault and extended incarceration after missing his court date of \$400,000, inclusive of attorneys' fees and costs.</p> <p>Due to 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 \$400,000 is recommended.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 49,871
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 10,000



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:	January 21, 2024
Briefly provide a description of the incident/event:	<p>Plaintiff Kamryn Garbutt sued the County of Los Angeles for the following: Violation of Civil Rights against a Probation Officer and two Supervising Probation Officers; Unconstitutional Custom, Practice or Policy; Inadequate Training/Policy of Inaction; Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights; and Supervisory Liability.</p> <p>On Sunday, January 21, 2024, Plaintiff alleges he was physically abused by a Probation Officer in the shower area of Camp Paige and that Supervising Deputy Probation Officers were aware and failed to intervene, or act. The Plaintiff alleges he teased the defendant, a Probation Officer, about supporting the opposing football team, which ended up upsetting him. Later that evening, the Plaintiff alleges the Probation Officer choked him while taking a shower and did not stop until another probation officer intervened. The next day, the plaintiff alleges supervisors urged the Plaintiff to complete an affidavit stating nothing happened to him and threatened to delay his release from court the following day should he speak up regarding the alleged attack on him by the Probation Officer. Plaintiff further alleges the supervisors cancelled his court appearance that was scheduled for the next day and consequently confined for another month because of it.</p>

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

- A. Employee used unreasonable/prohibited use of force in violation of Abusive Institutional Practices.
- B. Allegations of retaliatory action and cover up (threatening to cancel youth court appearance so he would not report use of force)
- C. Lack of CCTV around facility

2. Briefly describe recommended corrective actions:

(Include each corrective action, due date, responsible party, and any disciplinary actions if appropriate)

- A. The department's current policy prohibits inappropriate and/or abusive acts to youth. A memo was issued on September 17, 2025, to all RTSB staff, reminding them of the policy outlined in RTSB Manual Section 1108 – Abusive Institutional Practices.
- B. A memo was issued on September 17, 2025, to all RTSB staff, reminding them of the guidelines outlined in RTSB Manual Section 1705 –Anti-Retaliation (L) regarding the Bureau's anti-retaliation policy.

RTSB Manual Section 1705 (L) Anti-Retaliation policy states the department has zero tolerance for retaliation against anyone who reports alleged policy violations, including inappropriate or excessive force. Officers, youth, partner agency personnel, visitors, or other staff assigned to the facility shall not be retaliated against (including shunning) for reporting and/or intervening in any alleged policy violation. Any activity or knowledge involving verbal, physical, or written threat to youth, staff, partner personnel, or visitors shall be immediately reported. This includes incidents of suspected abuse, use of force, or retaliation against whistleblowing (whistle-blowers report alleged wrongdoing or acts of fraud). Every person reporting an incident and acting in good faith shall be able to report an incident and be free from influence, threats, or restraint. No one shall prevent any other person from reporting or otherwise bringing to the attention of inappropriate and/or prohibited behavior. Staff shall be trained on the prohibitions, consequences, and measures to ensure the reliability of the complaint/grievance process related to retaliation, including the assignment of a Bureau Chief to address the need for interim protections for those who report. Those who violate this provision are subject to discipline up to and including termination.

- C. Camp Paige is temporarily closed but scheduled for the installation of CCTV cameras in early 2026. The camp may reopen later depending on operational needs of the department. Although cameras will not be installed in the shower area, they will be placed at the entrance of the showers which provide access to who enters and exits the area.

During shower supervision, staff are positioned within the shower area to eliminate any blind spots and to ensure all youth are safely supervised.

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)

Crystal Hurtado

Signature:

Crystal Hurtado

Date:

11/18/2025

Name: (Department Head)

Stacy Lopez-Maddox

Signature:

Stacy Lopez-Maddox

Date:

11/19/2025

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:

11/19/25

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	Maria Evila Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	23NWCV00478
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	February 14, 2023
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Internal Services
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 45,500
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	MICHAEL SANCHEZ, ESQ. Mendez & Sanchez, A.P.C.
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	MELISSA A. MCCAVERY, ESQ. Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This lawsuit arises from a vehicle collision that occurred on July 20, 2022, when an ISD employee rear-ended Plaintiff's vehicle on Norwalk Boulevard and Imperial Highway in the City of Norwalk.</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	\$ 40,064
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 25,353

CASE SUMMARY

INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF LITIGATION

CASE NAME	XJ Grand Hotel LLC, et al. v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
CASE NUMBER	22STCV09617
COURT	Los Angeles Superior Court
DATE FILED	March 18, 2022
COUNTY DEPARTMENT	Chief Executive Office
PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AMOUNT	\$ 175,000
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF	Michael Weiss, Esq., Akerman LLP
COUNTY COUNSEL ATTORNEY	Roberto Saldaña Senior Deputy County Counsel
NATURE OF CASE	<p>This is a recommendation to settle for \$175,000, a claim for breach of contract and negligence brought by Plaintiff.</p> <p>Plaintiff is seeking property damages against the County of Los Angeles arising out of the County's occupancy of Plaintiff's 97 room Hotel under the County's Project Roomkey to provide temporary housing to persons experiencing homelessness during the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>
PAID ATTORNEY FEES, TO DATE	\$ 138,446
PAID COSTS, TO DATE	\$ 11,689

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

November 17, 2025

1. Call to Order.

The meeting of the Los Angeles County Claims Board was called to order at 9:38 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 Administrator 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: Shawn Luna, Katherine Bowser, Melissa McCaverty, LaTasha Corry, Kevin Engelen, Christopher Keosian, Richard Hsueh, Vanessa Evangelista, Kent Sommer, Stacey Lee, and Keever Rhodes Muir appeared for the Office of the County Counsel. Christina Lee, and Lorena Moya-Rivas appeared for the Department of Children and Family Services. Rachel Lara, and Alvin Brewer appeared for the Fire Department. Sergeant Shanese E. Winfrey, Deputy Nancy K. Madarasz, Captain Christopher R. Minott, Commander Terrence L. Bell, Captain Nicole N. Palomino, Sergeant John E. Addington, Captain Richard J. Cartmill, Commander John P. Macdonald, and Lieutenant Patrick J. Hayes appeared for the Sheriff's Department. Julie Dixon Silva appeared for the Office of the District Attorney. Catie Mathers appeared for the Department of Health Services. Patricia Chan, Jacklin Injijian, Cid Tesoro, Andrew Ngumba, and Melissa Lara appeared for the Department of Public Works. Sylvia Schweizer appeared for George Hills. Avi Burkwitz appeared for Peterson Bradford Burkwitz Gregorio Burkwitz & Su, LLP. Geoffrey S. Sheldon appeared for Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. Aamir Raza appeared for Lawrence Beach Allen & Choi PC. Andrew Baum, and Thomas Barajas appeared for Glaser Weil Fink Howard Jordan and Shapiro. Irma L. Martinez appeared for Sanders Roberts LLP. Jeffrey Hausman appeared for Hausman & Sosa, LLP.

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 9:39 a.m., Claims Board Chair Destiny Castro convened the meeting in closed session to discuss the items listed below as 4(a) through 4(k).

4. Report on Actions Taken in Closed Session.

On the public teleconference phone line, a caller who self-identified as "Mark Wagner" was present to hear the reportable actions of the Claims Board.

At 1:09 p.m., the Claims Board reconvened in open session via video conference and reported the actions taken in closed session as follows:

a. C.G. v. DeLeon Country Home, et al. San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2315003

This lawsuit alleges breach of mandatory duty and negligence by the Department of Children and Family Services for failure to protect Plaintiff from sexual abuse.

Action Taken:

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

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

**b. Susana Alfaro v. Rigoberto Vasquez, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23NWCV00423**

This lawsuit arises from injuries Plaintiff allegedly sustained in a traffic collision involving a Fire Department employee.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(b) in the amount of \$52,185.

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

**c. Edith Gonzalez v. Eliezer Vera, Jr., et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 23CMCV00758**

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 4(c) in the amount of \$100,000.

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

**d. Andres Munoz Martinez v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 22STCV27830**

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 4(d) in the amount of \$98,000.

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

**e. Shannon Story v. County of Los Angeles, et al.
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21AVCV00558**

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(e) in the amount of \$1,200,000.

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

f. **Ana Gamez and Jung Kim v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV21176

This lawsuit involves allegations that employees of the Sheriff's Department were subjected to discrimination and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board continued Item 4(f) to a future meeting.

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

g. **Derrick Harris v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
United States District Court Case No. 2:21-cv-07999

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

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(g) in the amount of \$2,250,000.

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

h. **Phillip Glaviano v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case Nos. 23STCV24434 and 24STCV14999

These lawsuits concern allegations that a former employee of the District Attorney's Office was subjected to retaliation.

Action Taken:

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

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

i. **Carla Rice v. County of Los Angeles, et al.**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV28139

This lawsuit alleges that a former employee of the Department of Health Services was subjected to harassment, discrimination, retaliation, and wrongful termination.

Action Taken:

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

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

j. **Glenn Timmons v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV32561

This lawsuit concerns allegations that an employee of the Department of Public Works was subjected to age, race and disability discrimination, harassment, and retaliation.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved settlement of Item 4(j) in the amount of \$99,000 for economic reasons only.

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

k. **Sina Mardani, et al. v. County of Los Angeles**
Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 18STCV05076

This inverse condemnation lawsuit seeks compensation from the Department of Public Works for personal injury and property damages allegedly caused by sewage backflows.

Action Taken:

The Claims Board recommended to the Board of Supervisors settlement of Item 4(k) in the amount of \$4,500,000.

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

5. **Approval of the Minutes of the October 20, 2025, regular meeting of the Claims Board.**

Action Taken:

The Claims Board approved the Minutes of the October 20, 2025, meeting.


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

6. **Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CLAIMS BOARD

By


Laura Z. Salazar
Claims Board Administrator
Office of the County Counsel