

ROMAN DZURINSKIY,
Complainant,
v.
MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
Respondent.

MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY)
)
Respondent.)

³ 4 CSR 240-010(11).

filed its response, objecting to the motion, arguing that no law provides for the generation of a report upon filing of a motion. In the motion, Mr. Dzurinskiy cited no supporting law.

The law provides that Mr. Dzurinskiy may obtain information from any party in a contested case but, as Staff notes, such law is in the Commission's rule on discovery and data requests.⁴ A data request, Staff suggests, most closely resemble the motion, so Staff proposes to treat the motion as a data request and respond in the time provided for a data request. Staff's analysis is correct. Staff's treatment of the motion as a data request is appropriate. If Staff fails to respond in the time provided for a data request, Mr. Dzurinskiy may then seek enforcement.

Therefore, the Commission will deny the motion.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The *Motion to Order Staff (Investigator) Present an Investigative Report (for May 18 and August, 18, 2010) Visiting My Property and Its Findings* is denied.
2. This order is effective when issued.

(S E A L)

BY THE COMMISSION



Steven C. Reed
Secretary

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

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 20th day of October 2010.

⁴ 4 CSR 240-2.090(1) and (2).