Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Office of the Inspector General

Inventory of MTA Litigation Cases and Invoice Review

The audit found that some payouts were not included in the litigation case inventory list. The audit also found that outside law firm and County Counsel invoices for litigation expenses were accurate, but some requirements in contracts with outside law firms were not always followed.

Report No. 11-AUD-03 **November 1, 2010**

Metro

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Directors of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) directed the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to conduct an audit of MTA litigation cost management practices. As part of this audit, the OIG reviewed the preparation of the inventory of litigation cases and invoices for legal services from outside law firms and the County Counsel, and the results are discussed in this report. An audit consulting firm reviewed MTA's litigation costs and cost management performance including evaluating the efficacy and effectiveness of MTA's policies, procedures, and practices. The consultant prepared a separate report, which is being concurrently reported under Part B.

The audit found that some payouts were not included in the litigation case inventory list. The audit also found that outside law firms and County Counsel invoices for litigation expenses were accurate, but some requirements in contracts with outside law firms were not always followed.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF AUDIT

The objectives of the audit were to work with County Counsel Transportation Division staff to develop an inventory of cases litigated by the County Counsel within the last 5 years, test the accuracy and completeness of the inventory, and review the accuracy of outside law firms and County Counsel invoices for legal services.

To meet this objective, we performed the following:

- Requested County Counsel Transportation Division staff to prepare an inventory of all litigation cases closed during the period January 1, 2005 through February 28, 2010, and open as of February 28, 2010.
- Reviewed the inventory and related case costs.
- Reviewed outside law firms and County Counsel invoices.
- Compared payout amounts in the Financial Information System to the amounts on the inventory.
- Gained an understanding of the accounting system that tracks the costs and expenditures for litigation cases.
- Interviewed County Counsel Transportation Division attorneys and staff.

The audit was performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards. Those standards require that the audit be planned to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions related to the audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions related to the audit objectives.

RESULTS OF AUDIT

As requested by the MTA Board, the County Counsel prepared an inventory of MTA litigation cases within the last five years. The inventory list included litigation costs and settlements and recoveries incurred from January 1, 2005, through February 28, 2010. The costs incurred prior to January 1, 2005, were not included for those cases opened prior to that date because the costs were incurred outside the audit period. We also found that outside law firms and County Counsel invoices for litigation expenses were accurate. However, some requirements in contracts with outside law firms were not always followed.

A. Inventory of Litigation Cases

We requested County Counsel Transportation Division staff to prepare an inventory of MTA litigation cases that their attorneys handle and supervise. The inventory included 228 open and closed cases and a total of $41.4 million in litigation costs ($29.4 million for outside counsel and $12.0 million for County Counsel). Of the 228 cases:

- 190 litigation cases were closed during the period January 1, 2005, to February 28, 2010; for these cases, the inventory showed that litigation costs totaled $17.8 million, payouts/settlements totaled $52.4 million[1] and recoveries totaled $5.4 million. Outside counsel costs totaled $8.9 million, or about 50% of the total litigation costs for closed cases on the inventory. (See Attachment A for additional details.)

- 38 litigation cases were open as of February 28, 2010; for these cases, the inventory showed that litigation costs, so far, totaled $23.7 million and payouts/settlements totaled $60,000. Outside counsel costs totaled $20.5 million, or about 87% of the total litigation costs for open cases on the inventory. (See Attachment A for additional details.)

- Analysis showed that litigation costs[2] incurred totaled less than $100,000 for 179 (78%) of the 228 cases in the litigation case inventory. Of the remaining cases, 41 (18%)

[1] About 86% of this amount represents one settlement for insurance coverage issues involving the construction of the Red Line.
[2] Includes outside counsel and County Counsel litigation costs incurred during the period January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010.

incurred litigation costs ranging from $100,000 to under $1 million, and 8 cases (4%) incurred costs exceeding $1 million. (See Attachment B for additional details.)

- Analysis of the litigation case inventory showed that 39 of the 228 cases incurred payout/settlement payments totaling $52.4 million.[3] Of this total, 23 payout/settlement payments were under $100,000, 14 payments fell in the range from $100,000 to under $1 million, and 2 payments exceeded $1 million. (See Attachment C for additional details.)

The litigation case inventory list showed 61 case types/categories. The top five case types accounted for 104 (46%) of the cases. These five case types in order of magnitude are: employment, public liability/public damage[4] (PL/PD), wrongful termination, breach of contract, and civil rights (see Attachment B for entire list of case types). We suggest that County Counsel consider providing MTA management data trends on the type of litigation cases aimed at limiting future litigation and payouts. For example, the case inventory included 30 cases related to employment and 21 cases related to wrongful termination. This could be an area for future management emphasis of practices in these areas and assessment of manager training needs.

1. Litigation Expenses and Settlement Costs

Litigation expenses and settlement costs for some open and closed cases in the litigation case inventory list provided to us did not include all expenses incurred during the life of the cases because the costs were incurred outside the audit period. The inventory included costs incurred during the period January 1, 2005, to February 28, 2010. However, 78 (34%) of the 228 open and closed cases were initiated prior to January 1, 2005, (63 cases started in 2000 to 2004 and 15 cases started prior to 2000).

We believe that County Counsel staff made a reasonable and responsive effort to prepare the litigation case inventory list. Case cost information is maintained in and retrieved from two separate systems.

- An analyst at the County Counsel Transportation Division maintains Microsoft Excel spreadsheets to record the invoices submitted to MTA for payment. The spreadsheets contain invoice amounts from outside law firms and County Counsel. The analyst also maintains separate spreadsheets with running totals for outside law firms and County Counsel costs incurred for each case since July 1, 2004.

[3] Includes payout/settlement payments incurred during the period January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010.
[4] A third party administrator supervised by MTA's Risk Management Department processes and handles about 3,000 PL/PD claims a year. Outside law firms, retained through County Counsel legal services contracts, are used to litigate these claims. The County Counsel provides legal services for some of the PL/PD claims.

- The analyst obtains costs, if needed, from prior periods from the County Counsel's office at the County Administration Building.

We requested that County Counsel staff provide us with the total litigation expenses for six large cases, which were opened prior to 2000.

Case	Expenses Included In Inventory (1)	Expenses Not Included in Inventory (2)	Total Litigation Expenses (3)
1	$13,147,594	$23,991,065	$37,138,659
2	4,436,460	15,434,650	19,871,110
3	1,867,523	6,369,799	8,237,322
4	552,465	178,527	730,992
5	259,175	13,336,631	13,595,806
6	247,967	640,286	888,253
TOTALS	$20,511,184	$59,950,958	$80,462,142

Notes: (1) Expenses incurred from January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010
(2) Expenses incurred prior to January 1, 2005
(3) Total expenses as of February 28, 2010

The audit consulting firm performed additional work in the area of implementing an automated case management system that would provide centralized, real-time access to case information, status, and costs; and made a recommendation in its separate report, which is being concurrently reported under Part B.

2. Settlement and Payout Amounts

We found that settlement payments totaling $495,797 were not included on the litigation case inventory list provided to us.

a. RMIS Case Numbers Were not Always Assigned.

MTA litigation settlement payments are recorded in the Financial Information System (FIS) account number 50919, "Misc Claims/Awards." We reviewed transactions in this account for the period of January 2005 through February 2010 and traced the settlements to the litigation case inventory list prepared by County Counsel Transportation Division staff.

We found five payout/settlement payments,[5] totaling $291,347 for four cases, that were not included in the litigation case inventory. County Counsel staff acknowledged that they prepared the check requests for these payouts. They did

[5] Four of the five payments were in 2009.

not include these cases in the inventory list because a Risk Management Information System[6] (RMIS) case number had not been assigned; thus, there was no tracking of these cases. We were told that the reason these cases were not assigned a RMIS number was they were considered small cases that did not require much legal work and the work was done in-house rather than by an outside law firm. All hours worked on these types of cases were included on the invoices presented to MTA in one of the "Overhead" codes. We believe that all litigation cases should be assigned a RMIS case number so that the cases and related expenses can be tracked and managed.

b. Settlements Were Inadvertently Omitted from the Inventory List.

We found that 2 payouts/settlements in FIS totaling $204,450 were not included on the initial litigation case inventory list provided to the OIG by the County Counsel Transportation Division.[7] The cases for these payouts were assigned a RMIS case number and the cases were listed on the inventory. The analyst at the County Counsel confirmed that these 2 payouts should have been included on the inventory list. County Counsel officials advised us that one settlement was not included in the inventory because the analyst who prepared the inventory did not understand that payouts for attorney fees are part of the settlement. In the other instance, the analyst misunderstood and pulled payout information by fiscal year rather than calendar year.

We believe that an automated accounting system and/or case management system will facilitate the tracking of all expenses and payouts associated with each case.

B. Review of County Counsel Invoices

1. Billing Hours and Rates

Our review of County Counsel invoices for Transportation Division attorney and paralegal legal services did not identify any deficiencies.

The County bills MTA by the hour for attorney and paralegal[8] services. These individuals maintain timesheets that record the RMIS case numbers and hours they worked. This information is entered into RMIS. The County uses information from this

[6] RMIS is an automated system that is maintained by the County Counsel office at the County's Administration Building.
[7] After we identified this deficiency, we adjusted the case inventory list to include the $204,450 that had been omitted from the inventory.
[8] The rates charged for attorneys and paralegals are fully burdened rates that include benefits and a proration of the costs of the Assistant County Counsel and legal secretaries. These rates are lower than the normal County Counsel rates to reflect the value of overhead costs provided by MTA.

system to prepare the monthly bill to MTA. The billable hourly rates for FYs 2009 and 2010 were:

Job Title	Hourly Billing Rates (A)	
	FY 2009	FY 2010
Assistant County Counsel	$0	$0
Principal/Senior Deputy County Counsel	$194.05	$182.95
Deputy County Counsel	$164.11	$154.72
Senior Associate County Counsel	$135.73	$127.96
Senior Paralegal	$84.55	$79.71
Paralegal	$75.86	$71.52
Legal Secretary	$0	$0

Note (A): These rates reflect Metro providing overhead expenses for the County Counsel Transportation Division working in the MTA Gateway building.

During Calendar Year 2009, the County invoiced MTA for 26,541.5 hours totaling $4,566,192.48. We reviewed the invoice for January 2009, which totaled $372,544. We obtained the supporting timesheets for the two pay periods[9] in January 2009. We determined that the total number of hours on the timesheet for each individual agreed with the total number of hours on the invoice. In addition, the hourly rates on the invoice were the correct rates for FY 2009. We also tested the December 2009 invoice and found that the hourly rates billed were the correct rates for FY 2010.

2. Invoiced Amounts for Other Services

We found that the County's bill for other services appeared reasonable and appropriate for legal work. We reviewed the County's invoices for other services for the period January 1, 2009, through March 3, 2010, which totaled $700,615.69. These expenses were for a variety of goods and services such as court reporter transcripts, serving subpoenas, library services, Lexis Nexis on-line services, copying services, and supplies and services provided by the County. In our opinion, these expenses appeared appropriate and related to legal services.

We determined that there were a total of 15 invoices (totaling $6,931.80) for reproduction and duplication services that were sent to an outside firm rather than having the work performed by the MTA's reproduction department. We interviewed the three attorneys that ordered these services. They provided us reasons for not using MTA reproduction

[9] The County Counsel uses exactly two pay periods for each calendar month, covering the first through the fifteenth and the sixteenth through the end of the month.

services in these 15 instances, such as need for confidentiality, quick turn-around, and multiple copies in the format with tabs, and bound as required by the courts.

C. Review of Outside Law Firm Invoices

The County Counsel's Transportation Division uses Los Angeles County contracts (service agreements) to engage outside law firms for its litigation cases. We selected for review all 55 invoices that were identified in Financial Information System (FIS) with an invoice date in January 2009, February 2009, and January 2010. The 55 invoices were submitted by 12 outside law firms. The service agreements for the 12 law firms we reviewed were effective prior to August 1, 2008. The billed amounts on the 55 invoices totaled $1,229,636; of this total, $521,567 represented costs for outside consultants and experts. For these 55 invoices, we:

- Verified whether five key requirements in the service agreements with outside law firms were followed.
- Compared the amount paid by MTA to the amount on the invoices.
- Compared the hourly billing rates on the invoices to the County Counsel's list of authorized billing rates for each law firm for the period reviewed.
- Reviewed the Invoice Approval – Assigned Attorneys form to determine whether invoices were properly approved for payment, and the correct general ledger account was cited on the form.

We found that County Counsel staff reviewed and approved the invoices for payment. Our review did not find discrepancies in the amounts paid to firms, hourly billing rates on the invoices, authorization to pay invoices, and general ledger accounts charged. However, we found that improvements were needed in several areas to ensure compliance with contract requirements. Specifically, requirements in 4 of 5 contract areas reviewed were not always followed as discussed below.

Review of Service Agreement Requirements

1. **Requirement:** The current Guidelines for Billing Invoices in the Service Agreement states that billing invoices shall contain the current/correct County Counsel RMIS case number.

   We found that 26 out of the 55 invoices did not contain a RMIS number. Invoices containing the County Counsel RMIS number help ensure that the invoiced amount is charged to the correct litigation case. All of the contracts reviewed were older contracts that did not include the requirement to reference RMIS numbers on invoices. These law firms included some form of case identification (e.g., name of case) on their invoices. County Counsel Transportation Division officials told us that they will request the law firms to reference the RMIS case number on future invoices.

2. **Requirement:** The Guidelines for Billing Invoices in the Service Agreement states that all invoices must include the following statement signed by the firm's supervising attorney: "*I have personally examined this billing statement. All entries are in accordance with the Agreement for Professional Legal Services, are correct and reasonable for the services performed and costs incurred, and no item on this statement has been previously billed to County.*"

   We found that 9 invoices submitted by three law firms did not have the required billing declaration statement signed and dated by the firms' supervising attorney. The declaration statement signed by the firm's supervising attorney ensures the supervising attorney takes responsibility for the correctness of the invoice billed. County Counsel Transportation Division staff told us that if the required declaration is not included in the invoice, they are now requesting the law firm to submit the declaration.

3. **Requirement:** The Guidelines for Billing Invoices in the Service Agreement states that the invoice must include the date and who gave prior approval for incurring extraordinary expenses such as consultants, experts, investigative services, and travel outside Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties.

   All 17 invoices that billed for extraordinary expenses did not contain the required information as to who preapproved the extraordinary expenses and the date of approval.[10] Twelve of the 17 invoices contained billings for consultants and experts totaling $521,567.28.

4. **Requirement:** The Guidelines for Billing Invoices in the Service Agreement states that the billing invoice and backup material should be current, readable, and understandable. The Billing Invoice should describe on its face what services were rendered, and what expenses were incurred and why, without necessary reference to any other documentation.

   We found that an invoice and back-up material for coping services did not adequately describe the methodology for the amount billed, what services were rendered, and what expenses were incurred without necessary research and reference to other documentation. One law firm billed Metro $381.73 monthly for coping services. The only documentation submitted with the invoice was an estimate cost sheet for a Xerox

[10] A California State Auditor report issued in July 2004 recommended that MTA should "ensure outside counsel adhere to all billing requirements detailed in contract provisions and billing guidelines, including requiring that outside counsel receive written prior approval to use consultants and expert witnesses within an established budget."

Work Center submitted from a third party vendor in October 2006. The cost sheet stated: "12 months: $260.26/month plus sales tax of 8.25% plus estimated $100/month for supplies based on an average office use of 10,000 copies/prints, $381.73 due each month on the 15th from October to September 2007." A handwritten statement on the cost sheet circled the $381.73 and stated: okay per [the supervising attorney] agreement to bill MTA."

We determined the law firm billed MTA $381.73 monthly for coping services from October 2006 through February 2010 (41 months). Based on the documentation provided with the invoice (the third party vendor cost estimate discussed above), it appeared the law firm might have over billed MTA. We referred this matter to County Counsel staff for further research with the law firm. On August 19, 2010, the law firm responded that no lease contract was ever signed with the third party vendor who prepared the October 2006 cost estimate. The law firm made a decision to purchase a Xerox copier and used the $381.73 estimate to bill MTA for simplicity. The law firm invoiced MTA $381.73 monthly starting October 2006 because this cost estimate was the lowest best estimate from a vendor. The law firm stated that their tests of the costs showed average costs exceeding $450, which indicates that MTA is being billed less than the actual costs.

We believe that County Counsel staff should request the law firm to submit documentation that more accurately describes the rationale for billing $381.73 monthly for coping services.

5. **Requirement:** Exhibit I of the Service Agreement states that the County's legal and accounting staff shall review all billing statements prior to payment to outside law firms.

   We found compliance with this requirement. Our review of 55 invoices found that County Counsel Transportation Division staff reviewed the invoices prior to payment. The County Counsel's practice is for the Administrative Analyst to check invoices to determine whether the hourly billing rates are correct per the contract. Then the invoices are forwarded to the Supervising Attorney for review of the invoiced items such as professional services and the other disbursements before payment.

Review of Other Areas

We performed other audit tests for the 55 invoices selected for review. These tests did not disclose any deficiencies. Specifically, we:

- **Reconciled Invoiced Amount to Payment Amount**

  For all 55 invoices reviewed, we found that the amount MTA paid matched the invoiced amount.

- **Verified Hourly Billing Rates on Invoices**

  We found that the hourly billing rates on the outside law firms' invoices were correct. The Administrative Analyst had previously corrected one invoice where an incorrect billing rate was used prior to making payment to the firm.

- **Verified Approval of Invoices Prior to Payment**

  We found that all 55 invoices were approved prior to payment by the County Counsel, Supervising Attorney, and Administrative Analyst. This was documented on the Invoice Approval – Assigned attorneys form.

- **Verified Costs Were Charged to the Correct General Ledger Account**

  We determined that the 55 invoices were charged to the correct general ledger account. We verified the accounts associated with the invoices to the General Ledger Chart of Accounts in the Financial Information System.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the County Counsel Transportation Division:

1. Assign RMIS case numbers to all litigation cases to ensure that the cases are tracked and costs and payouts for every case can be identified.

2. Request outside law firms that have older contracts to reference the RMIS case numbers on invoices.

3. Request outside law firms to execute on the original of each billing statement the required declaration certifying the accuracy of the charges if such declarations are not being submitted with the invoices.

4. Ensure that outside law firms (a) obtain County Counsel's prior approval for consultants, expert witness, out-of-town travel, and other extraordinary expenses, and (b) provide the pre-approval date and name of the approving County Counsel supervising attorney on their billing statements; and ensure that the amount billed corresponds to the amount pre-approved. If it is impractical to obtain prior approval due to emergent circumstances, require outside firms to explain on their invoices the reason pre-approval was not obtained.

5. Request the law firm to submit documentation that more accurately describes the rationale for billing $381.73 monthly for coping services.

COUNTY COUNSEL COMMENTS

On October 29, 2010, County Counsel provided us with a response, which agreed to the recommendations made in the report and stated that the recommendations have been implemented. Specific corrective actions initiated are:

- RMIS case numbers will be assigned to all litigation cases.

- All outside law firms have been instructed to reference the assigned RMIS case number on all invoices. Any invoice without a RMIS number will not be paid until the appropriate RMIS number is provided.

- All outside law firms have been instructed to execute on each invoice the required declaration certifying accuracy of the charges. Any invoice without a declaration number will not be paid until the declaration is provided.

- Outside law firms have been informed of the need to obtain County Counsel's prior approval for consultants, expert witnesses, out-of-town travel, and other extraordinary expenses. The law firms were also informed to provide the pre-approval date and name of the approving County Counsel supervising attorney on their billing statements. County Counsel will further ensure, as part of the invoice review and approval process, that the amount billed corresponds to the amount pre-approved.

- Documentation has been requested and received that supports the law firm's explanation that the monthly charges of $381.73 are less than the actual costs incurred.

See Part C for the entire text of the County Counsel Transportation Division's response.

Summary of Litigation Case[1] Inventory

	Closed Cases[2]	Open Cases[3]	Total
Total Number of Cases	190	38	228
Litigation Costs[4]			
County Counsel Costs	$8,868,274	$3,140,570	$12,008,844
Outside Counsel Costs	8,898,890	20,535,467	29,434,357
Total Litigation Costs	$17,767,164	$23,676,037	$41,443,201
Payouts/Settlements[4,5,6]	$52,253,677	$90,000	$52,343,677
Recoveries[4,7]	$5,425,721	$0	$5,425,721

Notes:

1. Includes litigation cases handled and supervised by County Counsel attorneys. The inventory does not include Workers' Compensation claims and most Public Liability/Property Damage claims. A contractor hired by MTA's Risk Management Department processes and handles about 3,000 PL/PD claims a year, and Risk Management uses outside law firms for legal matters concerning these claims. However, the County Counsel provides legal services for some PL/PD claims.
2. Includes litigation cases closed during the period January 1, 2005, through February 28, 2010.
3. Includes litigation cases open as of February 28, 2010.
4. Includes costs, payouts, and recoveries incurred from January 1, 2005, to February 28, 2010. Costs, payouts, and recoveries prior to January 1, 2005, are not included for those cases opened prior to that date.
5. Includes $214,450 that was not included in the initial inventory of litigation cases prepared by County Counsel staff. The OIG found that 3 payouts/settlements totaling $214,450 were not on the inventory list.
6. Includes 5 payouts totaling $45,655,000 found by the audit consultant that were not included in the initial inventory of litigation cases prepared by County Counsel staff.
7. Includes 2 recoveries totaling $2,532,919 found by the audit consultant that were not included in the initial inventory of litigation cases prepared by County Counsel staff.

Schedule of Litigation Expenses
Made During the Period January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010

Litigation Expenses (1)	Number of Cases		
	Closed (2)	Open (3)	Total
> $10 million	0	1	1
> $5 million and <= $10 million	0	0	0
> $1 million and <= $5 million	4	3	7
> $500,000 and <= $1 million	4	2	6
> $400,000 and <= $500,000	1	0	1
> $300,000 and <= $400,000	8	2	10
> $200,000 and <= $300,000	3	1	4
> $100,000 and <= $200,000	16	4	20
> $50,000 and <= $100,000	25	7	32
> $0 and <= $50,000	129	18	147
TOTALS	190	38	228

Note 1: Litigation expenses include both outside counsel and County Counsel costs.
Note 2: Includes cases closed during the period January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010.
Note 3: Includes cases open as of February 29, 2010.

Schedule of Payouts/Settlements
Made During the Period January 1, 2005 to February 28, 2010

	Case Status As of 02/28/2010	Payout/Settlement Amount
1	closed	$45,000,000.00
2	closed	3,000,000.00
3	closed	600,000.00
4	closed	375,000.00
5	closed	280,000.00
6	closed	275,000.00
7	closed	275,000.00
8	closed	247,968.98
9	closed	211,576.19
10	closed	200,000.00
11	closed	200,000.00
12	closed	198,000.00
13	closed	175,000.00
14	closed	175,000.00
15	closed	150,000.00
16	closed	112,700.00
17	closed	95,000.00
18	closed	91,750.00
19	closed	80,000.00
20	closed	75,000.00
21	closed	67,500.00
22	open	50,000.00
23	closed	50,000.00
24	closed	45,000.00
25	closed	43,000.00
26	open	40,000.00
27	closed	36,000.00
28	closed	31,992.60
29	closed	30,000.00
30	closed	25,000.00
31	closed	25,000.00
32	closed	25,000.00
33	closed	16,000.00
34	closed	15,000.00
35	closed	10,000.00
36	closed	9,500.00
37	closed	8,000.00
38	closed	5,500.00
39	closed	4,189.30
		$52,353,677.07

County Counsel Litigation Matters by Case Type
January 2005 to February 2010

Case Type	Total
Americans with Disability Act	9
Admin Record Certified	2
Age Discrimination	9
Arbitration	1
Bad Faith, Breach of Contract	1
Breach of Contract	17
Breach of Contract, Breach of Warranty, Fraud	1
Breach of Insurance Policy	1
CEQA	1
Civil Rights	11
Condemnation	2
Construction	6
Contract	2
Contract	1
Contract - Personal Injury	1
CPUC-Noise Mitigation	1
Criminal (Coordinating Witnesses & Produce Records Only)	1
Debarment	1
Disability Discrimination	6
Discrimination	10
Electricity Rate Violation	1
Eminent Domain	3
Employment	30
Employment Discrimination (Defend Deposition Only)	1
Employment Discrimination	4
Encroachment (Never Filed)	1
Environmental	2
Environmental Cleanup	1
Excessive force, sec. 1983	1
False Claims	1
Gold Line	1

Case Type	Total
Gold Line Claims	1
Injunction	1
Inverse Condemnation	6
Labor Code	1
Lease	1
Medical Malpractice	1
Metrolink	1
MTA Claim	1
Negligence	1
Orange Line	1
Pasadena Claims - Gold Line	1
Personal Injury	3
Petition To File Late Claim	1
PL/PD	25
Preservation of Evidence	1
Public Records	1
Public Records Litigation	1
Qui Tam	1
Quiet Title	1
Racketeering	1
Redline Segment 2	1
Restitution	1
Set Aside Fraudulent Transfer	1
Sexual Harassment	5
Stop Notice	1
Transactional	7
Vandalism	1
Writ of Mandamus	2
Writ of Mandate	1
Wrongful Termination	21
(Blank)	6
Grand Total	**228**