

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

Complainants Motion for Restoration of Services

Complainant submits his motion for immediate restoration of services due to the following.

- 1) During the evidentiary hearing respondents witness, Mrs. Krcmar openly admitted to altering documents. While labeling them as her “personal” documents how does the PSC or the Honorable Judge Clark know if the Respondent didn’t alter documents pertaining to this matter.
- 2) Complainant has reason to believe based on Mrs. Krcmar’s response of altering documents that Respondents purposely and knowingly alter several documents that they presented to the Commission in order to present an outcome that would persuade the Commission to give a favorable outcome to the Respondents.
- 3) Respondents exhibits admitted onto record 119C is a altered document, not supplied by Twilio or SendGrid, but is a altered document of input values that Mrs. Krcmar, herself personally crafted to persuade the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark into believing that is was a copy from SendGrid or Twilio, when the fact is that it is a altered document crafted by the Respondents.
- 4) Respondents legal counsel purposely and knowingly tried to persuade the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark with documents in which they knew that their regulatory liasion Mrs. Krcmar spent time altering.
- 5) Respondents counsel with the intent and with the intent to and are coconspirators of Mrs. Krcmar’s statement given via WebEx and knew their witness , Mrs. Krcmar explored and admitted to altering documents.
- 6) Respondents simply cannot be trusted in any exhibits and all exhibits that have been given to the Commission or the Honorable Judge Clark , as while Mrs. Krcmar clearly stated she altered “personal” documents and how “easy” it was to alter documents concludes that Respondents in an effort to persuade the Commission to agree with Respondents claims, most likely altered documents to introduce that persuasion to the Commission.
- 7) All Respondents documents submitted to the Commission should be taken under extreme caution and as possibly altered documents to persuade the Commission to draw a considerable favor of an outcome.

8) Respondents legal counsel were coconspirators to the alteration of documents and knowingly knew their regulatory liasion behind the scenes was altering documents.

9) Respondents regulatory liasion under oath at the evidentiary hearing openly admitted to altering documents. While she openly admitted to altering "personal" documents because she said it was "easy " this means that under oath there is the great possibility that in fact, Mrs. Krcmar and their legal counsel engaged in the activity of altering several documents listed as exhibits given to the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark to pursaude a outcome of favortism to them.

10) Complainants motion also outlines from the beginning of this matter in which the Respondent and their counsel have committed perjury when under oath and not under oath.

11) Respondents exhibits contain a great deal and amount of documents in which don't have the letterhead of the company in response of their logs, but more towards typed up pieces of paper to explain how the process works with reason to believe that Respondents altered numerous document exhibits to pursaude a favorable outcome.

12) Such as the Respondents are also trying to alte the meaning of payment agreement to "pending payment agreement."

13) Respondents trying to alter the term of payment agreement to "pending payment agreement" would change in how they have to follow guidelines to proceed with a disconnection of services.

14) Respondent under oath open admitted to altering the exhibits that the Complainant proude from payment agreement to verbally "pending payment agreement." When in reality and on paper it is an actual payment agreement, not a "pending payment agreement." That Respondent would like to verbally alter.

It would be a continued gross amount of neglect and now knowing that the Respondents regulatory liasion on camera via WebEx under oath openly admitted to altering documents that the Complainants service reaminging off would be a violation of all commission rules, regulation and tariffs as outline in all Commission rules, regulations and tariffs.

The law and Missouri State Statutes doesn't allow for a utility provider to openly admit to altering documents and keeping the services of the Complainant, who has show more than a well satisfactory of documents in which clearly show that Ameren Missouri illegally disconnected services prior to the arranged agreed date.

In fact Missouri law doesn't allow the Respondents to use deceptive and deceiving business practices in keeping utility services off, due to the utility provider themselves admitting not only that they altered documents, but also verbally altered payment agreement, as it clearly states on their payment agreements, to verbally producing "pending payment agreement."

Whereas the Complainant prays that the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark not only take Ameren's exhibits under caution as there is a great possibility that to favor or persuade the Commission to favor a outcome towards the Respondent searched methods of altering, committed alteration and knowingly under oath admitted to altering and some sort of altering in which they openly admitted how "easy" it was to alter.

In addition services to the premises should be immediately restored to the premises as a result of the Respondents own admission of altering documents and failing to abide by an and all such payment agreements entered in on May 18, 2023 for May 22, 2023.

The law doesn't allow for the Complainant to suffer as a result of Ameren's gross neglect and own response of altering for the Complainant to suffer as a result of their actions.

In fact there is reason to believe since Respondents regulatory liaison under oath openly admitted that she altered documents, Complainant respectfully also asks that the Commission, Staff of the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark open an internal investigation into the matter of in which Respondent admitted that she altered documents and what other altered documents through any internal systems the Respondents have done to get favorable outcomes in any all PSC disputes between any Complainant with Ameren Missouri.

Brett Felber