

**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.)	

POST-CONFERENCE ORDER

Issue Date: November 14, 2013

Effective Date: November 14, 2013

The Missouri Public Service Commission is ruling on the matters discussed at the November 13¹ conference, which include matters arising from the October 16 pre-hearing conference, as follows.

On November 4, Craig Mershon filed an *Objection to the Unfair Treatment of the [Opposing] Attorney and Proposed Hearing Schedule*² (“objection”). Also on November 4, Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri (“Ameren”) filed a response to the objection.³ On November 7, Mr. Mershon filed a *Motion to Cease Harassment from Ameren Union Electric Company and [Its] Employees*⁴ (“motion”).

The objection and the motion each requested a conference to discuss matters that arose at the pre-hearing conference, including disconnection notices, scheduling, and service of documents.

¹ All dates are in 2013.

² Electronic Filing and Information System (“EFIS”) No. 50.

³ EFIS No. 51.

⁴ EFIS No. 57.

Disconnection Notices

In the motion, Mr. Mershon asks to receive no disconnection notices from Ameren. At the conference, the parties agreed that Mr. Mershon's account is not subject to imminent disconnection. Ameren also noted that the Commission's regulations require Ameren to issue a disconnection notice under specified facts, and alleged the notices comply with Ameren's Commission-approved tariff. Mr. Mershon did not dispute that argument, but argues that the form of the disconnection notice is subject to improvement, which he will propose by draft that he intends to file eventually. Therefore, the Commission will deny the request to halt disconnection notices.

Schedule

On October 17, Ameren and Staff filed a proposed procedural schedule.⁵ Also on that same date, the Commission ordered Mr. Mershon to file a response to the proposed procedural schedule stating:

If Mr. Mershon disagrees with the proposed schedule, his response shall propose an alternative schedule.

In response, Mr. Mershon filed the objection. In the objection, Mr. Mershon states that he has had no opportunity to file a proposed procedural schedule. Neither the objection nor the motion includes any alternative dates. By separate order,⁶ the Commission has directed the parties to file proposed procedural schedules. Ameren and Staff filed a new proposed procedural schedule on November 14. The separate order makes Mr. Mershon's proposed procedural schedule due on November 22. Therefore, this order will make no further ruling on scheduling matters.

⁵ EFIS No. 42, *Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule of Ameren Missouri and Staff*.

⁶ EFIS No. 59, *Ameren Missouri's Proposed Procedural Schedule*.

Filing and Service

In the objection, Mr. Mershon recounts Ameren's request for his email address, to which Mr. Mershon objects, because Ameren employed a format for attachments that Mr. Mershon states is difficult for him to use. At the conference, Mr. Mershon stated that his ability and inability to work with documents depends on the format as follows. A PDF is difficult for him to open and read. An email with the document's text in the body is workable. Hard copy is the easiest format for him to work with. Ameren and Staff agreed that service of any document on Mr. Mershon will be in hard copy by mail, with an email transmission setting forth the document's text in the body of the email.

The Commission has already given Mr. Mershon permission to file any request for any ruling by email, directed to the regulatory law judge assigned to this action, and copied to the other parties.⁷ The Commission will expand that ruling to any document that Mr. Mershon files with the Commission. Mr. Mershon may file any document with the Commission by emailing the regulatory law judge assigned to this action ("judge") at Daniel.Jordan@psc.mo.gov and copying all other parties. The judge will forward any such document to the Commission's data center.

Using email will expedite the Commission's consideration of any document. Mr. Mershon may also employ other methods of filing and service as provided by law but the risk of transmission shall be with Mr. Mershon. That includes the Commission ruling without the benefit of Mr. Mershon's input.

⁷ EFIS No. 31, *Order Setting Pre-Hearing Conference and Setting Conditions on Communications*, issued on September 12, page 2, paragraph 4.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The *Objection to the Unfair Treatment of the [Opposing] Attorney and Proposed Hearing Schedule* is denied.
2. The *Motion to Cease Harassment from Ameren Union Electric Company and [Its] Employees* is denied.
3. Craig Mershon may file any document with the Commission by the methods, and subject to the conditions, set forth in the body of this order.
4. 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 14th day of November, 2013.