

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber

VS

Ameren Missouri

To whom this may concern: I would first like to apologize to the Staff of the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark. At yesterday's hearing the language that I interpreted from me was clearly unacceptable, nor do I utilize it in any way shape or form, as yesterday should've been a more professional and serious manner in which I should have conducted myself. I am not making any excuse for it, nor do I condone the language that I used, but it is from a buildup of constant excuses given to me, along with frustration in how this manner is being conducted.

We are all human and we get flustered, especially when there have been 126 days of services to be disconnected illegally.

It seems every time I introduce a document, there is always an excuse or some sort of invalid reasoning as to why it shouldn't be admitted or be admissible. The products that were recently introduced are factual and cannot be denied. You can have the opinion all you want to try to say they aren't, but items don't come across with crucial information that show I am in the correct on this disposition. Also respondents counsel comment of "how he pays his bills was pretty unethical as well," especially when my bills easily correspond inaccurate charges and billing.

I do not apologize to the Respondents. They've left the last 126 days of excuse after excuse. They want, want, want, but they can't produce at all.

Counsel simply implied during a hearing in which I specifically asked for documentation of the items at which this hasn't been mentioned once, but mentioned on multiple occasions that they didn't have copies.

At that point, I did what anyone else would do and started reaching out to the appropriate contacts. I was given the accurate and complete information, in which Ameren and it seems the Honorable Judge Clark is not acceptable with.

We had the back and forth argument about a specific action and word yesterday. That word was Watermark.

Just to let everyone know, not only do I have 26 years of experience in the cellular industry, voip, cloud security, network integrations, cloud services, networking stability industry, but I also work very closely in the fields of data retrieval and recovery and authentication of validation of data.

First- I will start with the definition of Watermark- A watermark is used to create a translucent image on the paper to provide authenticity, therefore, it cannot be

altered. Watermarks can be invisible or appear visible in certain documents to deter the process of any alteration.

Watermark is the exact opposite of alteration.

Second, there are utilization programs in which as a data specialist that I utilize for clients that need authentication purposes. Trust me, every piece of paper that is given can be ran through an automated program that can supply retrieval through coding indexes if a document is a true or altered copy. I use around 3 of those, which require sign in data to a server database that is logged. I reserve the right to refuse to tell anyone what those programs are as they are supplied to be to use in my business.

I believe the Honorable Judge Clark made some stipulations on this matter in which that certain items would possibly be admissible during the evidentiary hearing if I was to send those in.

I'm pretty sure after repeating it over 300 times, everyone gets the point, in which services should be immediately restored.

I am willing to submit the documentation, however I have my own stipulation that I would like to add, which is upon introduction and showing them that the Honorable Judge Clark and the Respondent are prepared to restore utility services. I think that is fair to say. However, I don't think anyone is going to agree to this as I will get another excuse.

In addition, if the Honorable Judge Clark and the Respondent would like to take 30 minutes out of their day this upcoming Monday, therefore I can also utilize the programs that can validate the authenticity of documents, I am prepared to show clear proof with the programs of which items in which Respondent submitted to staff for their report and for their exhibits are real and fake documents. I've ran every document or "exhibit" through those programs. I reserve the right until a hearing is setup to discuss those.

I don't believe that there is any need for an evidentiary hearing based on everything that has been presented or I am willing to continue to present. However, I'm tired of excuses. I've been sold excuses from Respondent for a long time and it is tiring.

It's okay if the Respondent or the Honorable Judge Clark doesn't want to agree to that, however, I will then proceed accordingly with the recently filed lawsuit in which I've asked for a Pre-Judgment Action to be performed and a restoration of services, as a result of the breach and will accordingly have that served to parties involved. Based on the corresponding information I have already it is apparent that that a Pre-Judgment action being performed by the Civil Courts is necessary to mitigate and reduce the fraud that the Respondent has done in this matter.

Brett Felber