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Brett Felber

Vs

Ameren Missouri

Complainants Motion to Quash Staff Report

1. Complainant filed a informal complaint against Ameren Missouri on May 19, 2023, in which was converted over to a formal complaint on May 23, 2023.
2. Staff was ordered to submit a report to the Commission and all parties received a copy of the report on July 24, 2023.
3. Complainant wishes to discredit the validation of exhibt labeled D-C.pdf in the report in which they claim this is a copy of the payment agreement submitted.
4. . Rather than submitting a copy of the payment agreement, their “Regulatory Liason” prepared a blank piece a paper and manually put coding indexes in a balnk piece of paper and Ameren put what they felt about the payment agreement and gave no supporting documentation to prove this.
5. Complainant would like to attach a sample from Twilio, SendGrids Parent Company of how their services work.
6. Each email blast with SendGrid or Twilio, gives a template id number which can be seen at the top of the screen, prior to inputting of any values and gets sent along to the emailed party for further reference.
7. Respondents claim that a “senior software engineeer” put this together failed to include any and all template Id’s and in the coding source for any trace of the item and to make it look as if, the copy submitted in the staff report was an authentic or “duplicate” copy.
8. Complainant wishes to introudce directly from the source of Twilio, or SendGrid, exactly how their email API automation platform works. Attached for reference of all parties is Exibit A which showes step by step on how to input the values.
9. Notice on page 7 of 10 on the exhibit items being produced the “senior software engineer” as Ameren says failed to input the values of their direct email source of which who sent the email.
10. While it shows the complainants email, this bogus and typed on the go to make it look as if Ameren followed protocol, failed to input the values of the transaction number envelope number and Ameren Missouri the outbound sender DONOTREPLY email address.
11. Complainant can discredit the value, the authenication of the typed up piece of paper as a fraudulent form used in attempts to keep services off illegally.
12. Complainant introudces directly from the source the correct input values from in which should have been implanted by Ameren and their “senior software engineer” and what they failed to put on the blank piece of paper and put what they felt about the matter.
13. Respondents have not only taainted this mattert, they can no longer be trusted on any and all documents they have submitted, as which they are easily contradicted directly from the source, Twilio in the documentation that the Complainant is sharing with the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark.
14. Respondent in attempts have tried so hard to coverup this matter and make it look like they followed “protocol” when in fact they are missing crucial and key values that have to be input to the impede links and in which should have been reflected.

Whearas, the Complainant submits this exhibt as newly gathered data which will disprove, discredit and prove that Respondents submitted a fraudulent document to make it look, as if they properly sent a document and failed to proper impeded coded links, such as their email address in the coding values and exhibit D-C.pdf shall be quashed and inadmissable during any hearings and the evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully,

. Brett Felber