

EC-2024-0217

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

Also what Ameren Missouri fails to elaborate at concern is utility services were restored to the premises on Tuesday December 12, 2023. Ameren Missouri waited until December 18, 2023 to mail a letter stating I would be assessed a deposit. That is 1 day shy of a week. At no time prior to December 18, 2023 or when communicating back and forth with the only person that would reconnect services, Aubrey Krcmar, did she email me in any communication that I would be assessed a deposit.

Also, I would like to know about this Cold Weather Rule Payment that Ameren was going to allow me to utilize, because this is false. What the Respondent, Ameren Missouri fails to communicate or elaborate anytime after November 1, 2023, that Complainant tried to utilize the CWR payment, they were not able to utilize it. Customer service would not engage in setting this up. Customer service would automatically transfer me or take a message for Regulatory to contact me to discuss options. I never got one phone call back from Regulatory or a senior member of management between November 1 and December 7, 2023 to discuss or setup a Cold Weather Rule Plan. While Ameren Missouri did a great job of writing in on paper to the Commission to make it look like they would offer it. They never offered it when calling to set it up.

Essentially, I was robbed, extorted, forced and demanded to pay \$[REDACTED] to sacrifice even seeing electric services even being remotely on. Meanwhile in the report and order from matter EC-2023-0395, nowhere in the report and order does the Commission or Regulatory Judge even talk or engage in the talk of why \$[REDACTED] is demanded or due for electric services. In fact there are no ledgers, receipts copies, calculations as to why Ameren was owed \$[REDACTED] Nothing in the report, just a simple statement of that the Complainant owes it, without concluding any facts.

Also as a FYI, St.Louis County's Transportation department doesn't require it. It is their Public Works Department. The County's Transportation department deals with highways and roads, not utilities.

The Respondent is a company that will go through great lengths to not only give excuses, but to find a way to blame the Complainant, when in it is the responsibility of the Respondent to give clear and concise agreements. The Respondent in this matter chooses to violate what policies they have in place, or alter them as they go.

Also there are no "monetary damages," as PTSD is a diagnosis or disease that occurs around trauma. The trauma, was the massive amount of extortion Ameren has been able to manipulate I the Complainant out of monies as a result. (Yes, there are other parties that have read the report and order.) Which in that report and order from EC-2023-0395, it shows those extortion methods.

Doesn't help either that the Regulatory Judge in EC-2023-0395 and the Commissioners failed to allow I the Complainant Discovery in the matter. To date Ameren owes me 107 pieces of Discovery that I have requested from them, in which they never gave.

I stand by my comment that Ameren Missouri needs to be fined, punished and prosecuted for every essential action they have violated against me over the years.

It is strikingly odd that the Respondents point out that the Commission is a body, yet this is the same body that investor owned utilities must abide by in Missouri. Essentially Ameren doesn't want the governing body find them liable, yet Ameren goes to the governing body for tariffs, rules, regulations and tariffs. So their defense is moot.

Respectfully,
Brett Felber

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Brett Felber". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "B" and several horizontal strokes that trail off to the right.