

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

I really appreciate Respondents input. It's almost like avoiding the topics of being brought up and trying to spin them. I'll take a little bit of time to elaborate on it.

I believe I've submitted now four different proposals in how we could all move on on this matter, yet Respondents fail to clarify that. Their counsel briefly talked over this matter prior to the formal complaint about arrangements, etc. They decided to ghost. I'm pretty sure if Respondents counsel digs deep in his email history he would see numerous tries to resolve a "payment agreement" and settle this matter however, it isn't an agreement that they agree with.

Lets talk about the verbal modifications that Respondents have interjected into this. Such as payment agreement. No less than four times and numerous times throughout the evidentiary hearing counsel imposed their payment agreements on paper are really "pending payment agreements." No matter what way they try to spin it, it really is a payment agreement, until they actually have their "digital media group" change the wording. Knowing that they are involved with a matter that regards it as a surrounding issues of payment agreement and "pending payment agreement." I would think that Respondents would want to change to asap. In fact, I doubt Ameren has a digital media group they are working with, because to date the agreements they are still producing stay the same. Lets also see the promises that Respondents lackluster counsel has told the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark and Staff on paper.

"We are trying to put matters like this on litigational hold."

"We agree with staff, and their recommendations."

"Respondents motion for leave to file report to staff in agreement of changing the language and agree with staff."

Not my words, Ameren's words. Instead of taking responsibility, Ameren would rather pass the responsibility to the consumer and have the consumer take responsibility for Ameren's lackluster and failed obligations.

Final payment arrangement, thus proves my point as show, they haven't changed the language, modified or taken the time to change. Thus the consumer still has to suffer, as a result of Respondents neglect.

Lets talk about the payment agreement that was given to staff. It was a JPG copy. It shows Respondents email address, Complainants email address and information that clearly shows when the payment agreement was to

commence on between both parties. Ameren wasn't happy about that copy, so they hounded for another copy, in which to preserve the documents original state a watermark indentation was made, therefore it couldnd't be modified. Again, Ameren wasn't satisfied with it, so I went to Twilio, SendGrid's Parent Company. Ameren implied in a staff report that they didn't have copy of the agreement. States in clear as day letters to the Commisison and Staff. I requested a copy. Got copies and offered to setup a meeting between parties and Ameren said ghosted me on that, as usual.

I believe that Ameren also stated during the evidentiary hearing, that "they didn't know who Twilio is? Are you kidding me? You do business with a company, but you don't know who the parent company is? Yeah, okay, and I have beachfront property in Nebraska for sale.

It's because the Respondents know they are in the wrong, continue to be in the wrong. Again, instead of taking responsibility and just admitting that they are wrong they would rather play the alteration game, that their own regulatory specialist, Aubrey Krcmar admitted to altering documents, because "it was easy."

Now I understand exactly why Respondents wanted a copy without a watermark, therefore they could tamper, forge and alter a copy they didn't have in their possession.

Context clues that have been given out during this matter.

"Ameren admits that they failed to send Mr. Felber a default notice."

"Payment agreements are really pending payment agreements."

"We don't have a copy."

"We are going to do better."

Also, where was the specailist that the Honorable Judge Clark prior to the hearing stated for Ameren to have readily available to answer questions about the techniciana? I believe that they utilized Mrs. Krcmar and not someone from that department? Unless I talked to some imaginary person? Maybe Ameren would like to clarify that or talk about that?

Also, where was the "senior software engineer" that the Respondents raved about that was also supposed to be "readily" available during the hearing? To a shocker , again it was , Mrs. Krcmar. What do I know.

Also as a FYI, "software engineers" use terms like API and IDP , not regular terms when comparing objects, but then again, Mrs. Krcmar is a crafter of all trades: regulatory, customer service, software, technical, etc.

Also lets not forget to referesh the memory of , Mrs. Krcmar who admitted to altering documents. I really don't care if she said it was her own personal

documents. She didn't present anything to show they were her own documents, therefore the Commission won't really know, will they?

Instead of staying on topic about the actual subject of the Complaint, Respondents Counsel brought up numerous businesses I have registered with the SOS's Office. If you look at every business I have registered across the US, whether in Missouri or another State they are all in compliance with all State and Federal laws.

No law states I have to run one business, but instead, counsel was fixated on my successful businesses over the actual topic of the Complaint, which is usually the biggest red flag of all when they divert and avoid the main subject of the Complaint and failing to have the people of expertise available at the hearing, as they were told.

It is absurd, unfound, absolutely disgusting that Respondents Counsel clearly doesn't want to admit that Ameren is in the wrong. Instead he would rather jump to unfound and absurd conclusions that don't make any sense and try to spin the topic around.

Such as Mrs. Krcmar admitting to alteration and admitting it was easy and trying to spin it.

Yes, their counsel in this matter are coconspirators of this matter. They knew what their regulatory specialist was doing and they are just as guilty as Ameren is.

As a subscriber of WebEx myself, I'm entitled to record the hearings, that is a privilege of paid subscribers of WebEx and Cisco meetings group. For my protection, I submitted a copy of the hearing and what Mrs. Krcmar stated to a higher authority than the Commission itself or the Honorable Judge Clark to make sure what I was hearing was correct.

Just let me know the day that the transcripts are going to be uploaded therefore that higher authority gets the necessary approval to restore services. Can't wait. Although I have concerns that those transcripts won't get uploaded to EFIS now, because I've gone to a higher authority to intervene in this matter.

While, respondents counsel is worried about what has been assumed about is employee's or the company or his image. Ameren has been allowed to defraud me, railroad me, try to extort me, deceive me, attempted theft of and diverging of funds. (didn't send out a notice for autopay) and to date they still continue to.

Their only excuse is that I bought a generator instead of paying them. That's right, I didn't. Because even if I tried to pay you, Ameren would've continued to play the same stupid games as they are doing this very instance.

FYI, the Governors Office is aware of this matter. The Attorney Generals Office is aware of this matter, local law enforcement is aware of this matter, the FTC is aware of this matter and it is indexed in the Consumer Sentinel Network and I can confirm that both Jermaine Grubbs and Eric Banks have open complaints with the Chief Disciplinary Counsel's Office for a handful of matters such as last weeks admittance of Mrs. Krcmar alteration of documents.

I have no plans to drop any open investigations outside the Commission and as a matter of fact, I expect a swift resolution coming outside of this matter this week.

The floor is all Ameren's if they wish to continue making ridiculous statements and not doing the many things they stated in their reports.