Daily Journal MAY 19, 2021

Dhillon • Diane M. Doolittle • Daralyn Durie • Sierra Elizabeth • Lisa Ells • Theane Evangelis • Deborah Leva Patricia L. Glasera Lisa Glasson • Demetria L. Graza • Tanyn Greene • Gay Grastlarain Grunfeld • Mona Z. Homa • Molod Drummond Hassen Gera Harison Mira Nashmalla Marva M. Hassan • Landa Harison • Mira Nashmalla Marva M. Hassan • Landa Kanayshankaya • Landa • Rornfeld • Balkany Mistatach • Jaro H. Kwaza • Imily Lam • Beanda Nase Doinnique with a Leipzig • Janet I. Levina Mista Standaher • Allion Nobella Jaro ittle • Sauh Londa • Susan Mac Cormac • Deborah Mallgrave • Heidi Mayon • Rachael Meny • Christine M. Margan • Marisol Corral Mork • Ann Marie Mortimer • Nanci E. Nishimura • Crystal Nix Hinera Megan © Neill • Liula Rabla Oswell • Lisa Perrochet • Stacy D. Phillips • Sarah Piepmeier • Life Newsman Gwand Rawiga Ross • Kelli L.Sager • Neema Sahni • Saina Shamilov • Dena C. Sharp • Luann Simmons • Kelli Scheid Smith

Mira Hashmall



ashmall, a certified appellate law specialist, represents employers in all phases of litigation, from counseling to appeals.

In 2020 she won summary judgment for Los Angeles County in a significant potential class action by 12,000 in-home caregivers seeking up to \$50 million in unpaid overtime. *Ray v. California Department of Social Services*, 2:17-cv-04239 (C.D. Cal., filed June 7, 2017).

Both sides pointed to a 1983 opinion from the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that held three Northern California counties were, along with the state, the joint employers of such workers. But Hashmall had the better argument, ruled U.S. District Judge Percy Anderson of Los Angeles, because the L.A. system under which the plaintiffs worked—known as the In-Home Supportive Services program—was meaningfully different from the system examined in the circuit ruling.

Among other evidence Hashmall found in discovery was that the state, not the county, issued the workers' timesheets,

paychecks and tax forms. Anderson's ruling clarified the limited role L.A. County plays in implementing an important government program.

In a case that addressed Los Angeles' chronic homelessness problem, Hashmall, working with county counsel, reached a major agreement with a civil rights group to invest up to \$293 million over five years to bring almost 7,000 unsheltered people indoors. *L.A. Alliance for Human Rights v. City of Los Angeles*, 2:20-cv-02291 (C.D. Cal., filed March 10, 2020).

That disposed of part of the case, but Hashmall is now working to have the county dismissed from the remaining litigation after plaintiffs sought to have the City of Los Angeles raze Skid Row, Hashmall said. "What the local landlord plaintiff wants is for officials to offer shelter to the homeless and, if they refuse, to have them forcibly expelled under the anti-vagrancy laws," she added. "My client [the county] has no such laws."





MILLER BARONDESS LLP
LOS ANGELES

Practice Type: Appeals, Litigation