

EO-2024-0244
Change Of Supplier

In addition, I fail to see why I would cite statutes to questions I've asked for Ameren Missouri and their undersigned counsel to answer? Since when does asking a simple yes or no question refer to citing statutes?

Undersigned Counsel's Motion to Dismiss is a common deflector of what she was simply asked to respond to and what I brought forward in a Complaint. I am not an attorney, nor do I wish to become an attorney and my job is not to cite Statutes to questions asked.

Simple yes or no questions don't have to be answered with citing statutes. However, I should rather ask the Commission to cowardly dismiss this matter.

Not sure if Ameren's undersigned counsel has looked at any of my filings in which I've said if they admitted the document was a counterfeit and forged document I'd probably dismiss the matter.

Essentially, I know why they don't want to admit the truth, because then it shows they did commit a rather large violation.

Personally I would just like to see her file a response to if she thinks www2.ameren.com is an actual email address for sending and receiving emails. Also the PAG terms of table border, cellpadding, cellspacing, color and wtable.

Maybe she can elaborate why a Statute would need to be cited for someone filing a complaint about a counterfeit document?

I've stated numerous times, I'm sure the Commission is tired of me. I know Ameren is tired of me. I'm tired of myself and sound like a broken record when I keep asking for a yes or no response to if www2.ameren.com is a valid email address.

The fact that Ameren's undersigned counsel wants a statute cited for the clarification of an email address is a practice of a party that is a Con Artist.

When Ameren Missouri and their undersigned counsel filing decides to stop with her pathological lies and answer the question and sends a certified cashier's check back to the Complainant in the amount of \$██████, then I will gladly dismiss my matter. However, until then I have the right, the Commission has the right to know if www2.amerem.com is an email address.

Mrs. Hernandez doesn't want to answer that because she knows it's not an email address. Therefore exhibit D NO MPSC 0027 is a forged, counterfeit document that was used to deceive and defraud me out of money.

Can't wait for her filing that is due in matter EC-2024-0217. That 30 day timeframe is running close. Maybe her and forgery specialist, Krcmar should work Easter Sunday to pump out some more counterfeit documents. Maybe the "senior software engineer" will help them too?

Ameren's Motion to Dismiss fails to answer the Complainant's Complaint. When Ameren's undersigned counsel files an admittance to the questions I asked in a filing on March 28th, 2024, then I will gladly file a Motion to Dismiss this matter, until then I the Complainant and the Commission have the right to the truth about the document.

Welp, stay tuned everyone. Looks like the manure excuses from Ameren's Counsel continue to come.

I know what she should do in matter EC-2024-0217, she should ask the Regulatory Judge for sixty days to file a response . Yeah, that would be swell.

Maybe she can cite the Statute for feeding the Complainant cow manure? What's the Statute for that?

Again, I don't expect my Change of Supplier to be approved. I said that in a realistic filing, however, I want Ameren Missouri to expend all their money on my complaints until they are eventually bankrupt.

I'm only doing the same exact thing as Ameren does.

Ya'll should stay tuned for EC-2024-0217. I'm sure her filing is going to be just as delightful as the one she filed in this matter.

However, my job is not to cite a statute to a clearly altered, forged and counterfeit document or cite a statute to aq bogus email address.

In fact, I don't think there is a statute for www2.ameren.com. It's a simple yes or no answer, if it is a valid email address.

I think the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark should keep this matter open until she answers the questions I asked.

Ameren's undersigned Counsel practice of engaging as an Attorney is probably worse than the Attorney, Frito Pendejo.

Maybe she can look up who Frito Pendejo is, because she certainly reminds me of him.

Welp, gotta go. I'm going to glue my phone to my ear waiting for that response to www2.ameren.com that Ameren Missouri stated they would get back to me on March 14th and March 15th. Maybe she meant after Easter? Yeah, I'm sure that is what it is.

Maybe she'll tell the truth and answer the question on April the 4th.

Brett Felber
March 29, 2024