

# **FORMAL CIVIL–RIGHTS GRIEVANCE REGARDING THE KILLING OF MRS. RENEE NICOLE GOOD**

**Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment  
Violations, Unlawful Use of Deadly Force,  
Denial of Medical Aid, and Systemic SOP  
Failures**

**Recipients (Non–Exhaustive):**

**Federal Bureau of Investigation (Civil  
Rights Unit)**

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

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security,  
Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties**

**U.S. House Committee on Oversight and  
Accountability**

**U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland  
Security & Governmental Affairs**

**State Attorney General**

**State Peace Officer Standards & Training  
(POST) Authority**

## **I. STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCE AND PERSONAL FORESEEABILITY**

I submit this grievance concerning the killing of Mrs. Renee Nicole Good, a wife and mother whose death could just as easily have been my own after performing an ordinary parental act—dropping a child off at school and returning home.

This was not an extraordinary or unforeseeable encounter. It was an everyday scenario escalated by law enforcement into a fatal constitutional violation. The foreseeability of this harm is precisely why limits on police authority, use-of-force doctrine, and medical-aid obligations exist.

## **II. ABSENCE OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY TO DETAIN**

At no point did officers possess lawful authority to detain Mrs. Good. Absent reasonable suspicion or probable cause of

a crime, officers may not compel compliance. A citizen retains the right to disengage and leave.

Fleeing from an unlawful attempted detention is not a violent act and does not create legal justification for deadly force. The Fourth Amendment protects citizens against unreasonable seizures, including seizures effectuated by gunfire.

### III. CONTROLLING SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT – DEADLY FORCE AGAINST A FLEEING PERSON

The Supreme Court has clearly held that deadly force against a fleeing person is unconstitutional unless the officer has probable cause to believe the individual poses an immediate threat of serious physical harm to the officer or others. Mrs. Good was unarmed, not violent, and not posing an immediate threat. The constitutional standard was not met.

**Lethal force under these circumstances is unlawful.**

#### **IV. VIOLATION OF BASIC LAW- ENFORCEMENT SAFETY SOP**

**It is a universally taught and mandatory law-enforcement safety principle that officers do not place themselves in front of or alongside a moving vehicle. This principle exists because doing so manufactures danger and converts a controllable encounter into a lethal one by officer choice.**

**An officer who voluntarily positions themselves in a vehicle's path cannot lawfully claim fear of harm created by their own actions.**

#### **V. VIDEO EVIDENCE DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS OFFICIAL CLAIMS**

**Multiple videos recorded by legal observers present at the scene directly contradict official characterizations of the**

incident.

The videos demonstrate that:

Mrs. Good is clearly heard verbally waving officers past her.

Multiple vehicles successfully pass in front of her, including a law-enforcement vehicle.

The claim that she was “blocking traffic” is demonstrably false.

The encounter occurred at or immediately adjacent to her own residence.

Any narrative asserting that Mrs. Good posed a traffic obstruction, public threat, or engaged in terrorism is factually indefensible in the face of this evidence.

## VI. OFFICER POSITIONING AND BALLISTICS EVIDENCE

Video evidence shows both officers’ legs clearly visible beside Mrs. Good’s vehicle at the moment the first shot is fired.

Officer Jonathan Ross is seen leaning

toward and over the hood and fender of Mrs. Good's vehicle at that time.

This positioning conclusively refutes any claim that the officer was being struck, dragged, or imminently run over.

After the first shot, Officer Ross chased the moving vehicle and fired two additional rounds. All three shots struck Mrs. Good's face.

The act of pursuit followed by continued firing cannot be reconciled with a claim of defensive or reflexive action. It demonstrates deliberate, sustained use of deadly force after any alleged threat had dissipated.

## **VII. FAILURE TO FOLLOW OFFICER-INVOLVED SHOOTING PROTOCOLS**

Following the shooting, mandatory officer-involved shooting procedures were not followed.

Officer Jonathan Ross:

**Was not immediately disarmed.**

**Did not surrender his weapon.**

**Was not escorted away from the scene by another officer.**

**These steps are required to preserve evidence, protect the integrity of witness statements, and ensure public trust. Their omission undermines any claim of a legitimate or unbiased investigation.**

## **VIII. DENIAL OF MEDICAL AID – DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE**

**After Mrs. Good was shot, medical aid was not rendered. More critically, aid was actively denied.**

**A physician was present at the scene and offered assistance. Law-enforcement response was reportedly “I don’t care.”**

**Additionally, an ambulance was denied access even after leaving the immediate scene, compounding the violation.**

**Once a person is incapacitated, law**

enforcement has an affirmative constitutional duty to render or facilitate medical aid. Denial of aid after neutralization constitutes deliberate indifference to life, a separate and serious violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

## IX. FALSE OFFICIAL CHARACTERIZATIONS AND POST-HOC NARRATIVE FABRICATION

Characterizing Mrs. Renee Nicole Good as a “domestic terrorist” or public threat is an absolute falsehood, contradicted by multiple independent videos recorded by legal observers.

Such post-hoc character assassination does not legalize unconstitutional conduct. It signals an effort to justify fatal force after the fact rather than confront documented violations.

Mrs. Good was a wife, a mother, and a resident at her own home—not a terrorist,



not an aggressor, and not a lawful target of deadly force.

## **X. DEMANDS FOR FEDERAL AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT**

This grievance formally requests:

A full federal civil-rights investigation.

Immediate preservation and public release of all body-camera, dash-camera, dispatch, and communications records.

Review by Congressional Oversight

Committees into systemic failures and narrative manipulation.

Review by DHS Civil Rights and Civil Liberties for violations implicating domestic use-of-force standards.

Accountability for constitutional violations, denial of medical aid, and procedural misconduct.

## **XI. CONCLUSION**

Mrs. Renee Nicole Good had the legal right to disengage. She had the

constitutional right to be free from unreasonable seizure. She had the human right to live and to receive medical care once injured.

Her death was not inevitable. It was the product of unlawful escalation, ignored SOP, deliberate indifference, and false official narratives contradicted by clear video evidence.

This grievance is submitted for the public record and in anticipation of civil, administrative, and federal review.

Respectfully submitted,  
Concerned Citizen

Submission Emails / Offices (for copy-paste use)

Federal Investigative & Civil Rights Bodies

FBI – Civil Rights Unit: [civilrights@fbi.gov](mailto:civilrights@fbi.gov)

DOJ Civil Rights Division:

**civilrights@usdoj.gov**

**Department of Homeland Security**

**Office for Civil Rights & Civil Liberties**

**(CRCL): CRCL@hq.dhs.gov**

**Congressional Oversight**

**U.S. House Committee on Oversight and**

**Accountability: oversight@house.gov**

**U.S. Senate Homeland Security &**

**Governmental Affairs Committee:**

**hsgac@senate.gov**

**State-Level (Jurisdiction-Specific)**

**State Attorney General: typically listed on**

**the AG's official website (Civil Rights /**

**Special Prosecutions division)**

**State POST / Peace Officer Standards**

**Authority: jurisdiction-specific oversight**

**or standards bureau**