

EC-2024-0217

Brett Felber  
VS  
Ameren Missouri

### Motion to Quash

To the Regulatory Judge and Commission. The reason I am filing this Motion to Quash Staff's Motion is it further proves my point on this document and further proves that Staff failed to do their due diligence in reviewing this document or exhibit. More importantly counterfeit document.

Ameren submitted this document to conclude resemble a payment agreement. Further implication from Mr. Vandergriff is the Staff doesn't feel it is necessary to check the embedding links that don't match a payment agreement and are is a countefeit document.

The Commission staff's latest filing is the latest tactic in which they don't which for the truth to come out or forward and Staff doesn't want to admit they severely errored in further analyze.

If Staff took the time to analyze the document they would clearly see that Ameren Missouri submitted a countefeit document that doesn't have an actual email address attached to their external domain.

The external domain implied Ameren indexed as www2.ameren.com. www2.ameren.com is not a valid email address and wouldn't be able to provide the necessary embeddment to send off an email, as shown by exhibits presented by the Complainant.

Instead of Staff trying to seek clarification from the Commission. They should try sending an email to www2.ameren.com, or better yet ask Ameren Missouri to try and send a document from www2.ameren.com. I doubt Staff wants Ameren Missouri to do that and I'm starting to doubt the Staff of the Commission in general about this matter, as they clearly don't want to admit the fact that it is a counterfeit document. There was no analyzing of the document at any time by the Staff or they would have seen it.

Further more, the PAG terms aren't even coded in the indexing correctly. If they would have properly embedded the proper PAG terms it would state 12 installments and \$██████, not table border, cellpadding, cellspacing, color, wutable.

Statute of Limitations do not apply to a fraudulent document or a countefeit document, more importantly a document that the Staff of the Commission failed clearly to analyze and further are pretty much admitting that they don't want to waste their time invesitgating because they know it is the truth.

Where does the protection for the consumer come into play at? That is why I would like to know from Staff of the Commission? Because clearly they are paving the way for the prepetrator to keep on prepetrating the victim, as the victim is I, not Ameren.

Staff didn't endure the fraud that Ameren subjected them to, I did. As a taxpayer in addition, I fund a lot of money to the State of Missouri to ensure that we receive fair treatment. The salary of the Commission is paid for by taxpayers, not Ameren Missouri.

The reason the document is being used in several different matters is to prove my point, that the Staff of the Commission failed to analyze the document and that it is a countefeit document which was used to extort me out of money.

It is used in EO-2024-0244 to constitute a Change of Supplier and in EC-2023-0395 to show that the Commission, Staff and the Regulatory along with the Commissioners erred in their decision.

Is the Staff implying that further analization of a counterfeit document cannot be used to setup an appeal or a re-hearing in which a decision should be reversed, further constituting a re-hearing?

At this point, I give less about the money, Ameren was supposed to reach out to me about the document and I have email data in which to date Ameren Missouri's legal counsel has failed to . However, Staff instead of wanting to actually consist of doing the job they are supposed to do would rather sit and further protect the prepetrator .

Another example which is labeled in the Staff report regarding the there was a certain document and Staff knows along with Ameren Missouri when I produced it they lied to not only the Commission, but the Staff. However, I will refresh the memory.

“However, during its investigation of the allegations made by the Complainant, Staff noted that Mr. Felber received a notification which did not include all required in 20 CSR 4240-13.035 (1) (C) 2 Denial of Service . The violation was also discovered during staffs investigation of EC-2024-0108.”

Staff goes on to stay they didn't violate anything, but then contradicted their own statement and stated that they did find a violation.

I mean come on here . A violation is a violation, regardless. However, in Staff of the Commissions eyes, they allow Ameren to use figure of speeches such as .

“Your honor we are trying to do better.” and “Ameren is aware of this violation and states it is in the current revision process.”

Those are figure of speeches and nothing that Ameren Missouri has done, implies that.

The purpose is to show that the Complainant was clearly lied to.

In fact I encourage Mr. Vandergriff to respond to my Motion to Quash his Motion for clarification by responding to the following items below.

Please admit that Staff in EC-2023-0395, failed to analyze Exhibit D of the Staff Report?

Please admit to the Complainant that Exhibit D No MPSC 0027 is not an actual payment agreement?

Please admit that exhibit D NO MPSC 0027 failed to embed an encode the correct PAG Terms as 12 installments and \$██████████per month?

Please admit please admit that exhibit D No MPSC 0027 is not only a counterfeit document, but it was used to fraudulently extort and defraud Brett Felber & family out of \$██████████?

Please admit that www2.ameren.com is not an external host and not a valid email address?

Please admit not only is www2.ameren.com is not an external host and valid email address, but the document submitted by Aubrey Krcmar and Ameren Missouri would have never reached Mr. Felber's email address , therefore that contradicts the actual payment agreement date.?

Staff of the Commission is just as responsible for this, as Ameren is. Instead of investigating and clearly admitting it is a counterfeit document, they would rather give an excuse, because they know that Staff's conclusion was an error.

Sorry, but I shouldn't be subjected to Staff's pivotal error's. Especially when they know that. It's called taking responsibility.

Staff would rather take a coward move in protecting the perpetrator.

I respectfully ask that not only do we setup a hearing about this document, which is clearly crucial, but apply the Golden Rule to Staff and more importantly ask Ameren's legal counsel why she lied to the Complainant in setting up a time or dates to discuss this document.

Staff's filing is no more than the instruction of Mrs. Contessa King, in which when I reached out to her on March 14, 2024 voice my concerns and stated " you know it's a counterfeit document and I really wish the Staff of the Commission would have investigated this document. "

It's called shotty work and shotty business ethics and practices and it is no more than a hiding that the Staff of the Commission failed to properly acknowledge that the document was fraudulent.

When the Staff of the Commission and Ameren Missouri issue an apology and admit responsibility then the matter can be closed. In fact, that I stated that it isn't about the money, it's about the lies at this point. It's about the truth.

However, the Staff is starting to resemble the pathological lying too. Every time and investigation is ordered they uncover that there actually is a violation that occurred.

For that reason I respectfully ask that the Regulatory Judge setup an hearing with Staff and Ameren regarding this document and that the Staff's Motion be quashed, because it further proves that Ameren in fact not only committed on violation, but two. The second violation was admitted by Ameren and the Staff, in which should have resulted in a violation in EC-2023-0395.

Also, there is no Statute of Limitations for counterfeit document.

The sooner Staff and Ameren Missouri take responsibility and admit it is a counterfeit document. The sooner it will be dropped. I just want to darn truth. That is it. Something they are afraid to do.

Also civil is when you admit to the mistakes and take responsibility for your actions.

Criminal is when you continuously lie about the actions and make up another lie to try and cover up those actions.

At this point it's criminal conduct, not civil.

Brett Felber

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Brett Felber', written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping initial 'B'.