

# **FORMAL GRIEVANCE & DEMAND FOR INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION**

**Death of Dr. Linda Davis – Savannah/  
Chatham County, Georgia**

**Date: [Insert Date]**

**SUBJECT: Fatal Civilian Death Resulting  
from Federal Enforcement Pursuit –  
Demand for Accountability, Discipline, and  
Policy Reform**

**This letter constitutes a formal grievance  
and urgent demand for a full, independent,  
and transparent investigation into the  
death of Dr. Linda Davis, an uninvolved  
civilian who was killed in Savannah/  
Chatham County, Georgia, following a  
vehicle pursuit initiated by federal  
immigration enforcement personnel.  
Public reporting indicates that federal**

agents attempted a traffic stop, that the driver fled, and that agents initiated or continued a pursuit through a populated roadway environment. During the pursuit, the fleeing vehicle collided with Dr. Davis's vehicle, killing her instantly.

If these facts are confirmed, this fatality was foreseeable and preventable. High-risk vehicle pursuits are among the most dangerous enforcement tactics employed in civilian environments. Decisions to initiate or continue such pursuits must meet strict necessity and proportionality thresholds. Failure to adhere to those standards constitutes reckless endangerment of the public.

Dr. Davis was not a suspect and was not involved in the enforcement action. Her death demands accountability, transparency, and structural reform.

# **I. CRITICAL QUESTIONS REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ANSWERS**

## **Authorization & Command Responsibility**

**Which federal component conducted the stop and pursuit?**

**Who authorized initiation and continuation of the pursuit?**

**What supervisory oversight occurred in real time?**

**What written policy governed decision-making?**

## **Risk Assessment & Terminations**

**What imminent threat justified a pursuit through populated roadways?**

**What alternatives to pursuit were considered or attempted?**

**At what point did the danger to civilians outweigh the need for immediate apprehension?**

**Why was the pursuit not terminated when risk escalated?**

## **Interagency Coordination**

**Were Savannah Police or Chatham County authorities notified or involved?**

**Did federal agents comply with local safety protocols and coordination practices?**

## **Evidence Preservation**

**Immediate preservation is required for all recordings, communications, telematics, dispatch logs, reports, and supervisory review documents.**

## **II. GEORGIA LAW: DUTY OF CARE AND PUBLIC SAFETY**

**Georgia law does not exempt emergency responders from liability when reckless conduct endangers the public.**

**Emergency vehicle privileges apply only when operators drive with due regard for the safety of all persons and do not protect reckless disregard for safety.<sup>1</sup>**

**Georgia law defines negligence as the absence of ordinary diligence and establishes liability when the breach of a legal duty results in injury.<sup>2 3</sup>**

**Liability principles recognize responsibility for negligent acts performed within official duties.<sup>4</sup>**

**Emergency response authority is not a license to endanger uninvolved motorists.**

### **III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND CIVIL RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS**

**Reckless government conduct that creates extreme danger to innocent civilians may implicate constitutional protections.**

**Executive conduct that “shocks the conscience” violates substantive due process.<sup>5</sup>**

**Government pursuit tactics causing fatal outcomes may trigger constitutional**

scrutiny.<sup>6</sup>

Civil liability may arise under federal officer liability doctrines and civil rights statutes where unlawful conduct contributes to loss of life.<sup>7</sup>

#### **IV. RESEARCH EVIDENCE: PURSUITS POSE A KNOWN PUBLIC SAFETY RISK**

Extensive research and federal data confirm that vehicle pursuits present significant risks to uninvolved civilians. A national study analyzing 2017–2021 data documented thousands of pursuit-related fatalities and identified an upward trend, with the Southern United States experiencing the highest proportion of deaths.

Federal justice data document the widespread use of pursuits and the uneven adoption of restrictive policies. Public health research has long

recognized that uninvolved motorists and bystanders represent a significant portion of pursuit fatalities.

These findings underscore that civilian deaths during pursuits are predictable risks, not unforeseeable anomalies.

## V. POLICY STANDARDS AND NATIONAL BEST PRACTICES

Modern pursuit policies emphasize: necessity and proportionality, supervisory authorization and oversight, continuous risk assessment, termination when public danger outweighs enforcement need, prioritization of civilian safety over apprehension.

Georgia law enforcement guidance has recognized that terminating a pursuit may be the most reasonable and professional decision in the interest of public safety.

**National policy guidance increasingly recommends limiting pursuits to situations involving violent offenses or imminent threats to life.**

**If federal agents engaged in or continued a pursuit where such thresholds were not met, the decision would fall outside contemporary safety standards and accepted risk-management practices.**

## **VI. DEMANDS FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND CORRECTIVE ACTION**

**In light of the severity of this incident, the following actions are demanded:**

**Independent investigation by the DHS Office of Inspector General.**

**Public identification of all agents and supervisors involved.**

**Administrative leave and disciplinary review pending investigation outcomes.**

**Referral for criminal review if reckless**

**conduct or policy violations are substantiated.**

**Public release of pursuit authorization records and supervisory communications.**

**Preservation and release of recordings, dispatch logs, and related evidence.**

**Civil rights review by the U.S. Department of Justice.**

**Independent review of interagency coordination and pursuit decision-making.**

**Revision of federal pursuit policy to prohibit pursuits absent imminent threats to life.**

**Transparent communication and formal acknowledgment to the family and community.**

## **VII. WHERE TO SEND**

**Federal Oversight**

**DHS Office of Inspector General**

**245 Murray Lane SW**

**Washington, DC 20528**

**DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil  
Liberties**

**Washington, DC 20528**

**CRCLCompliance@hq.dhs.gov**

**U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights  
Division**

**950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW**

**Washington, DC 20530**

**Congressional Oversight**

**House Committee on Homeland Security**

**Washington, DC 20515**

**Senate Committee on Homeland Security  
& Governmental Affairs**

**Washington, DC 20510**

**State & Local Authorities**

**Georgia Attorney General**

**40 Capitol Square SW**

**Atlanta, GA 30334**

**Office of the Governor of Georgia**

**Atlanta, GA 30334**

**Chatham County District Attorney**

**Savannah, GA**

**Savannah Police Department – Internal**

**Affairs**

**Savannah, GA**

**Mayor & City Council of Savannah**

**Savannah, GA**

**(Verify current mailing addresses prior to submission.)**

## **VIII. CONCLUSION**

**Dr. Linda Davis lost her life as a result of an enforcement action in which she played no part. When enforcement tactics create foreseeable danger to innocent civilians, accountability is mandatory. Public trust requires transparency, discipline where warranted, and policy reform that prevents future loss of life.**

**Respectfully,  
[Your Name]  
[City, State]  
[Email]  
[Phone]**

## **FOOTNOTES**

**O.C.G.A. § 40-6-6.**

**O.C.G.A. § 51-1-2.**

**O.C.G.A. § 51-1-6.**

**O.C.G.A. § 36-33-1.**

**County of Sacramento v. Lewis, 523 U.S.  
833 (1998).**

**Brower v. County of Inyo, 489 U.S. 593  
(1989).**

**Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403  
U.S. 388 (1971); 42 U.S.C. § 1983.**