

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

Complainants Rebuttal towards Ameren's responses.

Second Amended Complaint- Property Damage (34)

Complainant has no pad mount located outside or inside of the fence line to premises, therefore technicians should have never been anywhere near premises. Attached are exhibits A & B showing Ameren's technicians outside of my fence line with their binoculars. The nearest pad mount is two doors down from me. In addition, Ameren's could've utilized checking meter readings to see if there was any attempt to steal or commit theft of services.

Respondents counsel again is using mere excuses and lies in attempt to cover up the property damage that technicians did to the premises. Complainant the prior day on June 14, 2023, sent counsel a picture of Complainants Christmas tree lit up "stating that he still had power to the premises."

Complainant did nothing wrong, nor ever attempted to steal power or commit theft of power, Bogus and false accusation by respondent's counsel. In addition, there is no law that states no one can apply for services at the premises, whether personal or business. Any entity that tried to establish services were entities owned by me and my business partner. Other persons that applied were qualified for services and in fact, to the date Ameren has failed to state basis in writing to those parties to as why they were denied services under commission rule 4 CSR 240-13.035 denial of service. In which they haven't followed the protocol in notifying the parties why services were denied to premises.

Again, more lies and excuses out of Ameren through their counsel.

Affirmative Defenses (5)

I believe respondents counsel is reaching on this considering Ameren through counsel and employees made utterly false defamatory statements to St. Louis County Police Department in trying to have complainant arrested for filing more complaints with the AG's Office and filing a lawsuit against not only Ameren, but Mr. Banks, Ms. Grubbs and Mrs, Engelbrecht.

Who says that Ameren's employees can't defend themselves on this issue? They most certainly can. Again, counsel fails to articulate that those employees are crucial to the complaint, as they failed to follow protocols, which fall under employee dishonestly.

The fact of the matter is, respondents counsel doesn't want the employees that complainant has filed complaints against being part of the complaint is because counsel knows that Ameren failed to follow numerous protocols that I've mentioned numerous times and I've given them quite frankly numerous times to fix their methods of how they practice, however, that never has or will change. (Goes way before this PSC formal complaint.)

Again, counsel offers more lies and excuses.

Answer Original Complaint (20)

Again, Respondent through counsel is making more absurd statements and trying to blame complainants' phone, which has nothing to do with complainant's phone. It has to deal with how Ameren has used spoofing methods. Since Ameren uses a rob-calling service provider to place outbound calls, it is the responsibility of their robo-calling company to utilize that they are following the Truth in Caller ID Act, in which the companies real name appears. If there is a complaint registered, which there was registered with Mrs. Engelbrecht in April, via email with complainant, it becomes the responsibility of the business itself to make sure their robo-calling provider is utilizing the correct caller ID shown, as Ameren, not Boone County Government.

Answer Original Complaint (21)

Prime example of failing to allow me to dispute part of my account. I've let Ameren and their counsel know they are still charging me [REDACTED], but Ameren is still billing me for it in today's current balance or their "final balance" as counsel has stated. They should take that amount of the balance.

Answer Original Complaint (24)

Call me a conspiracy theorist, but I'm pretty sure Ameren went into selective mode on which recordings they have sent the commission or are attempting to send. Just as I most recently sent one of their employee's stating they would deny restoration of services.

Answer Original Complaint (23)

Respondents counsel fails to mention payment agreement dated May 18, 2023, for May 22, 2023. In fact, counsel doesn't mention that at all in his original answers or amended or affirmative defenses. Counsel doesn't want to bring that up, because he knows respondents failed to act accordingly and illegal disconnected services.

The fact of the matter is throughout the answer process, all that Ameren has done is given excuses to the exhibits, documentation and other proof that I have submitted to the PSC, not one actual physical document or exhibit has been submitted to contradict my complaint. Counsel gives excuses and lies and further continues to lie throughout the process.

In fact, counsel wants the complaint dismissed therefore the commission doesn't have to hear to complaint and Ameren doesn't have to answer to any of the exhibits and documents that complainant has already presented. Counsel knows that there is a great chance that Ameren would lose if this went to a trial, therefore in which is why he hopes the commission will dismiss the complaint.

The only "baseless" information given has come under the direction of respondent's counsel. The fact of the matter that he even went through great lengths to lie about Ameren, himself, Ms. Grubbs and Mrs. Engelbrecht not being party to a lawsuit filed.

Doesn't get anymore "baseless" than that. It is apparent, that respondents counsel believes everything he says is true because he's an attorney. Even against the substantial number of exhibits presented against them.

Brett Felber

Attached is a copy of my fence line, showing there is no pad mount outside of it and my camera's catching Ameren employee A & B standing outside of my fence line with their binoculars. No reason to be outside my fence line or near my fence line, when the pad mount is two houses down.

(Exhibits prove again, that counsel has offered mere excuses and cover up lies. When does respondents counsel quit with the lies?)

Again, until they are punished by not only the PSC, but the AG's Office and the Courts, Ameren is going to continue to use their deceptive and illegal tactics.