Bivens -- Federal Officer Damages Liability

Version 1.0 · Current · October 2026

What It Is

When a person is injured by a state or local officer's constitutional violation, the civil cause of action is 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Congress enacted it expressly. No equivalent general statute covers federal officers. The gap is partially filled by *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents* (1971), which created an implied damages remedy directly under the Fourth Amendment against individual federal narcotics agents who conducted a warrantless search and arrest. For four decades, courts treated *Bivens* as a growing federal analogue to § 1983. The Supreme Court has since spent those decades contracting it and now describes extension of the remedy as a disfavored judicial activity.

Only Three Approved Contexts

The Supreme Court has affirmatively recognized a *Bivens* damages remedy in exactly three settings:

1. Fourth Amendment – warrantless search and arrest by federal narcotics agents (*Bivens*, 1971)
2. Fifth Amendment equal protection – sex discrimination by a Member of Congress (*Davis v. Passman*, 1979)
3. Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference – federal prison officials' failure to provide medical care (*Carlson v. Green*, 1980)

Since 1980, the Court has repeatedly refused to recognize new *Bivens* contexts. The practical result is that *Bivens* is not a general alternative to § 1983 for injuries inflicted by federal officers.

The Modern Framework

Ziglar v. Abbasi (2017) established the current restrictive structure: courts must ask first whether the claim arises in a new context – meaningfully different from the three approved cases. The threshold for finding a new context is low. Potential differences include the constitutional right, the agency, the officer's rank, the statutory mission, the location, national-security implications, border or immigration enforcement, available alternative remedies, and the type of defendant. Even modest differences can produce a new context.

If the case does present a new context, the court asks whether special factors counsel hesitation – whether any reason exists to think Congress rather than the judiciary should decide whether a damages remedy exists. Relevant considerations include national security, foreign relations, border security, immigration enforcement, congressional attention to the field, available administrative grievance procedures, and system-

wide consequences of judicial liability. If even one rational reason for congressional primacy exists, modern doctrine generally refuses the extension.

Egbert v. Boule (2022) collapsed much of this analysis into a single practical inquiry: is there any reason to think Congress may be better suited to authorize damages? If yes, no *Bivens* extension. The Court explicitly held this even for a Fourth Amendment excessive-force claim against a Border Patrol agent arising from conduct on private property inside the United States near the border.

Border Enforcement: Hernandez and Egbert

Hernandez v. Mesa (2020): A U.S. Border Patrol agent standing in the United States shot and killed a 15-year-old Mexican national on the Mexican side of the border. The Court refused to extend *Bivens*, citing foreign-relations consequences, national security, border security, congressional primacy over immigration, and the distinctive cross-border context.

Egbert v. Boule (2022): A Border Patrol agent entered the plaintiff's property in Washington state, near the Canadian border, and used force. The Court refused to recognize *Bivens* for either the Fourth Amendment excessive-force claim or a First Amendment retaliation claim. Border Patrol enforcement differs from the original federal narcotics context, administrative grievance procedures exist, and national-security concerns weigh against judicial creation of a damages remedy.

Together, *Hernandez* and *Egbert* make *Bivens* claims against DHS border-enforcement personnel particularly difficult, even for purely domestic use of force.

What "No Bivens Remedy" Does Not Mean

A court dismissing a *Bivens* claim because the context is new, special factors counsel hesitation, or an alternative process exists is not deciding whether the officer's force was constitutional. The constitutional question and the remedy question are analytically separate. A case dismissed for lack of a *Bivens* cause of action should not be coded as force held lawful.

No Agency Liability Through Bivens

Bivens is a personal remedy against the individual officer. The United States, federal agencies (CBP, ICE, FBI, BOP, Secret Service, FPS), and other federal departments are not proper *Bivens* defendants (*FDIC v. Meyer*, 1994). There is no *Bivens* counterpart to *Monell* – no policy-or-custom theory that makes a federal agency liable for institutional constitutional violations through an implied remedy. The asymmetry with the state-and-local framework is significant.

Qualified Immunity Still Applies

Federal officers sued under *Bivens* can assert qualified immunity. This creates a two-stage structure: (1) does a *Bivens* cause of action exist, and (2) if so, is the officer entitled to qualified immunity? A court may reject the claim at stage one without ever reaching whether the officer violated the Constitution or whether the right was clearly established.

Alternative Remedies

When *Bivens* is unavailable, other possible remedies include:

- Federal Tort Claims Act – a statutory tort claim against the United States based on state-law tort principles (not a constitutional claim; the United States substitutes for the officer)
- Administrative grievance procedures – agency-internal complaint processes (after *Egbert*, their existence may weigh against *Bivens* even if they provide no judicial review or damages)
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 – federal criminal prosecution of the individual officer for willful deprivation of constitutional rights
- Injunctive or declaratory relief – subject to Article III standing
- Inspector-general investigation – non-damages administrative review

Whether any of these actually applies depends on the facts, and none is a functional substitute for a constitutional tort damages action in every case.

Federal vs. State/Local: The Asymmetry

A plaintiff injured by a state or local officer may pursue individual § 1983 liability (subject to qualified immunity) and municipal *Monell* liability (subject to a demanding policy-or-custom showing, but with no qualified immunity). A plaintiff injured by a federal officer faces a much narrower *Bivens* remedy (contracting), no agency-level equivalent to *Monell*, and alternatives (FTCA, grievance procedures) that differ substantially in scope and effectiveness. This asymmetry has constitutional and policy implications for how comparable force by federal and state officers is addressed in litigation.

Research Implications

For federal-officer force incidents, the following variables should be coded separately:

1. Constitutional merits – was the force objectively unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment?
2. Bivens availability – did the court recognize a Bivens cause of action?
3. Qualified immunity – if Bivens was available, did the officer receive QI?
4. FTCA – was a Federal Tort Claims Act action filed or resolved?

5. Criminal – was the officer investigated or prosecuted under § 242?
6. Administrative – what agency-level review or discipline occurred?

These are not interchangeable outcomes. Collapsing them produces incorrect legal analysis.

What Bivens Does Not Establish

- Federal officers are exempt from the Constitution
- Federal officers are categorically immune from damages
- Every federal excessive-force claim fails
- A failed Bivens claim means the force was reasonable
- FTCA relief is always available as a substitute
- Administrative remedies are equivalent to damages
- Qualified immunity and Bivens are the same doctrine
- § 1983 automatically applies when Bivens does not

HOW TO CITE

Edged-Weapon Response Lab. (2026). *Bivens -- Federal Officer Damages Liability*. In *EWRL Evidence Library* (Version 1.0). https://droptheknife.org/bulletins/bivens (https://droptheknife.org/bulletins/bivens)