

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

Craig Mershon,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
vs.)	File No. EC-2013-0521
)	
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER AMENDING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Issue Date: January 31, 2014

Effective Date: January 31, 2014

The Missouri Public Service Commission is granting in part the *Motion of Objection for Notice of Hearing Order Resetting Procedural Schedule, and Order to File Response*¹ (“motion”). Craig Mershon filed the motion on January 30, 2014. Ameren filed an expedited response on January 31, 2014, representing that Staff does not object to that response.²

The Commission’s order setting that schedule³ directed any objection by Mr. Mershon to propose alternative dates. Mr. Mershon complied with that order only as to discovery dates.

Mr. Mershon’s proposed date for beginning discovery⁴ of January 27, 2014 has already passed. As for serving any response or objection to discovery, Ameren and Staff agree with Mr. Mershon’s proposed deadline of February 7, 2014. Moreover, Ameren and

¹ Electronic Filing and Information System (“EFIS”) No. 78 filed on January 30. All dates are in 2014 .

² EFIS No. 81, *Expedited Response to Complainant’s Pleadings*, filed on January 31. All dates are in 2014.

³ EFIS No. 75, *Notice of Hearing, Order Re-Setting Procedural Schedule, and Order to File Response* issued on January 16, page 2, last unnumbered paragraph.

⁴ Mr. Mershon filed the complaint in this action on June 13, 2013.

Staff propose an expedited deadline for serving responses and objections to discovery of February 14, 2014. That schedule will allow completion of discovery well before the hearing date.

As to a conference to discuss any discovery dispute or other pre-hearing matter, Mr. Mershon and Ameren propose differing dates. As of the date of this order, no discovery dispute or other pre-hearing matter is pending, so no conference may be needed and the Commission will schedule none in this order. As to any discovery dispute, the Commission's regulations provide that a party seeking relief must attempt to resolve the dispute informally by telephone: first, with the other party to the dispute, and then by adding the regulatory law judge. If those two-way talks and three-way talks do not resolve the dispute, a written motion is the next step.⁵

Mr. Mershon did not propose alternative dates for the evidentiary hearing or briefing, so the Commission will not alter those dates, and will grant in part the motion as follows.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The *Motion for an Injunctive Relief to Prevent the Sending of the Threatening Disconnection Notices* is granted in part.

2. The procedural schedule shall be amended as follows.

<i>Event</i>	<i>Date</i>
Deadline to Serve Discovery	February 7
Deadline to Serve Response or Objection to Discovery	February 14

⁵ 4 CSR 240-2.090(8).

3. This order is effective immediately upon issuance.

BY THE COMMISSION



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Morris L. Woodruff".

Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary

Daniel Jordan, Senior Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority pursuant
to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 31st day of January, 2014.