

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber

VS

Ameren Missouri

Instead of Respondents Counsel trying to shield himself from responding back to the FTC and the CFPB, maybe he should respond back to the fraud claim that was sent to Ameren Missouri about the matter?

No, Respondents Counsel doesn't want to do that or Ameren to do that because they would all face stern actions for trying to collect on debt they claim is "legal," yet have failed to follow the designed practices of when a customer disputes a bill.

Instead Respondents want to brush the dispute off to the side, and would rather try to shield protections from the PSC, instead of talking to the FTC and answering the numerous documents they've been given.

That's because the Respondents know the debt isn't legal and they failed to follow a numerous amount of processing steps when proceeding to collect a debt, which requires validation.

To date Ameren hasn't provided a ounce of validation to the debt and in fact they've ignored it. In fact , Ameren, nor Banks Law LLC has sent a copy of Good Standing as requested in requirement that they are in Good Standing with the SOS office and allowed to collect debt.

I will not attach a copy of the police report that I got disputing the debt, as that has numerous personal identifying markers on it and I don't trust it on a public website, however, I will provide a copy of the debt letter and the letter I was given by the FTC . Exact information is also uploaded into the Consumer Sentinel Network.

The debt isn't valid, it is being investigated and the PSc doesn't have the authority to shield or force someone that has gone to a higher authority that specializes in the area's of FDCPA to order someone to pay a debt they don't owe.

Respondents counsel is living in a fantasy world in which because he says it, it makes it true. Respondents Counsel has given mere excuse to every piece of evidence that he has been provided to prior, during and after the necessary hearings.

Respondents representations are not only con artists and shills, but also thieves. Yes, thieves. They are trying to use aggressive litigator tactics in forcing to pay a bill they don't owe, but then failing to follow procedures to protect consumers from these same aggressive rogue tactics.

Outside of the PSC filings Respondents have a 0.00% of responding to any and all complaints with outside agencies. Because they know they are in the wrong on this matter and they expect shielding from the PSC .

The amount they are trying to collect has been placed in theft, they've failed to respond to it and they are knowingly still trying to collect an amount they know is labeled in fraud.

Ameren Missouri, Banks Law LLC and the other respondents in the complaint are violating Missouri State Statute 570.095.

Respondents Counsel has avoided service of process in two new lawsuits by stating to the process servers that their counsel doesn't work for Ameren Missouri to avoid service of those lawsuits, yet respondents counsel continually filing history shows 1901 Chouteau Ave Saint Louis, Missouri 63103. (Jermaine Grubbs) . I will not publish that through EFIS either, however yes, I've had two process servers try to serve new lawsuits to Ameren Missouri and their counsel without success.

Ameren Missouri wants to avoid outside litigation on this matter because they know they are in the wrong and thus trying to avoid.

Such as the continual shielding from the PSC.

To date my fair process of a "fair" hearing hasn't been fair at all. To date the PSC is protecting and shielding Ameren in a failure to release the evidentiary hearing transcript. The transcript that will point and prove that Ameren Missouri has a master manipulator named, Aubrey Krcmar who has experience and stated in her testimony that she "altered documents because it was easy."

There is no other utility provider in the St.Louis market and the PSC is allowing Ameren to further corrupt their practices and continue their con artist practices without consequence.

Ameren is a con artist company and their litigators are con artist litigators that prey complainants won't drive towards a desirable outcome.