

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

To whom this concern: Wasn't the transcript from the evidentiary hearing supposed to be uploaded through EFIS by October 18, 2023? I could be wrong about it? If someone can give better clarification of when they think it will be in EFIS I would appreciate it. I'm willing to come out of my own personal pocket to pay the reporting company for expedited , if needed too.

The only reason I really need it is so I can get it over to the agency that needs the transcript showing where Ameren's regulatory specialist admitted to altering documents, therefore they can get my services restored, without payment.

Or maybe it would be easier for Ameren Missouri to just admit and restore services or the services should be ordered to be restored, without payment.

Ameren seems focused on wanting a payment for failing to oblige to an agreement. I'm more interested in the part where their regulatory specialist mentioned that "she altered documents and that it was easy."

Ameren admitting to altering documents doesn't constitute them receiving a payment. If anything, they owe me a ton of money for the five months of generator drive services. In fact they are up to over [REDACTED], between gas usage and maintenance having to be performed on the generators that Ameren owes me. They can deduct [REDACTED] that Ameren owes me from the generators, gas and maintenance off the [REDACTED]. they claim I owe and mail me a certified cashiers check of [REDACTED].

I'm just pointing out the obvious. Ameren makes a crucial comment that points them at admitting to altering documents and the transcript still hasn't been uploaded.

Also another thing, I'm going to point out. Respondents Counsel states that EFIS document 119 is "altered" however that makes the other documents such as the JPG copy and the first original copy actual documents right? Since he failed to state they are altered, correct?

Usually that is what happens when a busines or respondent in this matter is doing such an incredible job of trying to cover up the matter. They get fixated on one object that they forget about all the objects involved and fail to talk about it.

So out of all the documents submitted for the payment agreements, he states one of the three submitted are "altered," even though we actually know that none of the documents are altered.

But we do have Mrs. Krcmar on video and whenever the transcript gets uploaded through EFIS admitting to alteration because it wasv easy.

Oh, the irony and hypocrisy!

Respondents Counsel can file a response if he pleases. I find his responses rather intriguing, because there's other things I can poke along the way.

Like, Mrs. Krcmar admitting to altrng documents "because it was easy!"

We forgot to send a default letter and notify Mr. Felber first class mail or personal service.

The one I like the best is "we are trying to put matters like these on litigation hold!"

Or, "we agree with the staff report"

The best though.

"Even though they say payment arrangement, they really aren't payment arrangements, they are pending payment arrangements."

"Oh, we are going to change the language and make imporvements immediately your honor, in fact we are working with our digital/corporate media group to change that."

5 months later..... They state the same thing.

Again, just pointing out the obvious!