

EC-2024-0133

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

If you notice in EC-2023-0395, one of Respondents hire legal counsel would rather criticize the new filing than actual enter an appearance and explain why to date Ameren hasn't done the following.

- 1) Had five months to work with their digital marketing advertiser to change payment agreement to "pending payment agreement."
- 2) Haven't changed their terminology, language or modify their payment agreements five months later?
- 3) Why they continue to send Ameren Missouri customers payment agreements and try to verbally modify their agreements to pending?
- 4) Why they lied to the Honorable Judge Clark in EC-2023-0395 and promised, "they'd do better?"
- 5) Why they lied to the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark in stating "they are trying to put matters like these on litigation hold?"
- 6) Why they lied to the Staff of the Commission in stating "they agreed with staff recommendation?"
- 7) Respondents, "They are really pending payment agreements even though they state that payment agreements have been established."

To today's date, Respondents have failed to do any of the 6 things listed above. Instead they want to criticize the party that bring it to their attention and would rather blame the party that filed a Complaint about it.

Another thing I really find intriguing.

Mrs. Krcmar- "I went into emails and noticed how easy it was to alter documents!"

Let me say it again!

Mrs. Krcmar- "I went into emails and noticed how easy it was to alter documents!"

Yet, their counsel was so happy that they admitted that, however when i the Complainant pointed out the obvious, they'd rather pass blame, instead of talking about it.

The Company that admitted to altering documents wants to avoid that subject and pass blame onto the Complainant simply because the Respondent failed to save a crucial document that proves I the Complainant am right and the Respondent is wrong.

Respondents would rather pass their constant failures that I have pointed out and instead of owning up to it, would rather blame the consumer themselves.

At the end of the day, these are words that the Respondent stated and failed to oblige to.

If the legal counsel wishes to engage and criticize the new filing, they I encourage him to file an entry of appearance therefore we can discuss this matter.

In simple terms, the customer shouldn't have to suffer or be forced to suffer because the Respondents can't fulfill the obligations that they set themselves towards and state.

Sorry if I sound harsh, but Ameren is a con artist company. They are nothing more than a Corporate shell, that gets over on Missourians. They haven't changed any of the "solutions " they admitted to, however they are great at manipulated or altering the minds of people on broken promises to keep utility services off.

I've never seen a business that has a out of 548 reviews has a 3.6 rating of complaints, out of their regulatory division has a 1.9 rating out of 47 reviews and a business that has had over 191 complaints closed in the last 3 years and 84 complaints closed in the last 12 months. Plus recently downgraded from a A+ business to a NR, with a disclaimer about the amount of reviews.

Their ratings speak for themselves and speak about the con artist practices and how they are Corporate Shills and their legal counsel are coconspirators of their shell and con artist practices.

I believe that the Commission should start looking for alternative and competitive utility businesses to be allowed to enter the territory of Missouri and Ameren should be fully investigated. They are a business that makes their paperwork disappear during a crucial disputes, not just my complaint.

When I say this matter is about protecting Missourians and their hard earned money, I specifically mean that statement, as Ameren is stealing Missourians money everyday, due to their practices they are able to get away with.

.The floor is back to Ameren who will probably talk about instead of getting a "generator" I should pay them.

No, I wouldn't have had to get a generator or generator/backup system, if they didn't breach the contract that they failed to oblige by that has been submitted numerous times. Respondents are purely upset because I am putting my hard earned money, into a generator/backup system to keep a home functional, instead of lining the Corporate shells pockets.