

EC-2023-0395

Brett Felber

Vs

Ameren Missouri

Response to Respondents Amended filing.

- 1) Respondent filed a response with the Commission to it's order by November 2, 2023.
- 2) Complainant filed a respondent to the Respondents answers.
- 3) Respondent filed a amended filing with the Commission on Friday November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023.
- 4) Despite respondents filing it doesn't change the articles of the surrounding facts that have been presented.
- 5) During the initial phone call to Ameren Missouri, the Complainant asked about the CWR plans. Complainant was denied.
- 6) Complainant filed a complaint with the AG's Office regarding the denial of CWR.
- 7) Complainant filed a motion with the PSC to elabroate on the denial of the CWR.
- 8) Complainant reached out to the informal side of the PSC and registered a complaint with the informal side of the PSC.
- 9) At approxiametly 3:43 pm the Commission ordered Ameen provide a response to as why the Complainant was denied CWR and surrounding detail.
- 10) Submission of the emails that both Respondent and Complainant show ther approx time of 4:39 pm and 4:40 pm.
- 11) Respondent didn't attempt any time prior to a order being issued and complaints registered against them for the denial to reach out to the Complainant to setup a CWR payment.
- 12) Respondent was in violation of 20 CSR 4240-13.055.
- 13) Respondent didn't attempt to reach out to the Complainant and made no attempts prior to the order being issued and the only reason that Respondents enacted and scrambled to allow or setup a CWR is because they knew they violated 20 CSR 4240-13.055 and that a CWR should've been established during the initial phone call at 10:57 am on November 1, 2023.
- 14) Respondent thinks because Ameren eventually decided to reach out to Mr. Felber about establishment of a CWR after filing a total of three complaints, should result in Ameren not being liable or held responsible for their violation.

15) Complainant was not on a CWR plan in 2021, Complainant was on a regular payment agreement in which, Ameren inaccurately billed the Complainant, which resulted in numerous complainants being registered and essentially a AG complaint being filed.

16) Complainant was successful at getting the "special" payment agreement re-established after filing a complaint with the AG's Office.

17) Respondent is trying to sell the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark a misleading story in attempts to keep services inactive.

18) On October 30, 2023, Complainant received a certified letter from, Aubrey Krcmar, that stated at the bottom that specifically stated : As this Ameren Missouri account is involved in a pending formal MPSC complaint (File No. EC 2023-0395) there will be no further attempts to collect on this debt until the complaint proceedings are done.

19) Contrary to the letter dated October 30, 2023 uploaded through EFIS for the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark to see, Mrs. Krcmar stated that the previous balance of \$ [REDACTED] must be paid in order to activate the CWR plan.

20) Ameren's own comments contradict themselves and even though they specifically state in a letter dated October 30, 2023 that they aren't going to attempt to collect, they are attempting to collect on a document that wrote to the Complainant stating they would cease to collect on until the proceedings were complete.

21) The Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark should order today November 3, 2023 that Ameren Missouri restore utility services to the premises without payment for the following two issues. 1) It would be negligent for the customer to be denied services, Ameren Missouri distributed a certified letter to Complainant Specifically stating that they wouldn't attempt to collect on the debt until the complaint proceedings are complete. 2) For violating 20 CSR 4240-13.055 CWR payments and plans and only after the fact , Ameren Missouri offered it is because they knew the violated the rule in place and it was offered after three complaint were registered about the denial.

22) If item 22 isn't acceptable to the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark, even though Ameren knows the balance, etc is in dispute and the letter Mrs. Krcmar sent states they won't attempt to collect on the debt, Complainant is willing to make an exception. That exception has now been offered three times to the Respondent. Which is Ameren Missouri restores utility services by the end of business today November 3, 2023 at the premises. Upon satisfactory of restoration, even though Mrs. Krcmar clearly stated that "there will be no further attempts to collect on this debt until the complaint proceedings are complete." Complainant is willing to send from his financial institution a certified cashiers check in the amount of the \$ [REDACTED]

23) it is the Respondent who is stalling the process in this matter. They simply think they can retract statements they issue and change their policies as they go.

Whereas the Complaint asks the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark to grant the Complainants Response and Motions and make a ruling on this matter today, November 3, 2023 and order the Respondents to restore utility services without payment as a result of the certified letter Mrs. Krcmar sent to the Complainant and violating 20 CSR 4240-13.055,

or Ameren Missouri restores utility services prior to receiving a cashiers check and the exception complainant has offered of \$ [REDACTED], after utility services are restored.

Brett Felber