

EO-2024-0244
Change Of Supplier

Oh and since Ameren's counsel thinks she's entitled to not answer the questions I'll go ahead and prior to any action on her Motion to Dismiss submit cause as to why the matter shouldn't be dismissed.

Ameren's undersigned Counsel failed to identify and or respond to any of the Complainants information. While it is true, Ameren Missouri is allowed access and is in the general area to perform services, it doesn't allow the provider to engage in the areas of taking advantage of customers and submitting counterfeit documents, forged documents and altered documents and then allow the provider to get away with not answering them.

When applying for those certificates from the PSC to do and conduct business, they are also swearing under oath and any Statutes whether State or Federal, rules, regulations and tariffs that they will engage in proper business practices and not to deceive customers or give misrepresentations in which allow them to deceive customers or Complainants.

The document in question, clarifies to the Public Service Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark that Ameren Missouri propounded themselves upon force engaged, reconstructed, altered, forged, produced a counterfeit document in which shows several numerous factors which details the engagement in deceptive practices.

1) An bogus email address. www2.ameren.com, isn't an email address nor does it resemble and email address. www2.ameren.com is a catching and forwarding domain that when entered into the search bar links to www.ameren.com and an external host catching directory and name.

2) The PAG terms listed in the document in question are nowhere near the remote identity of the trustfactor of the document and instead of linking and embedding the coding as 12 installments and \$ [REDACTED] they inserted non-numerical factors such as table border, cellspacing, cellpadding, color and wutable. None of those factors embedded would even resemble the clarification of the installment months or dollar value amount.

3) Third, the document in question would have never been sent as it has no @ symbol and isn't a valid email address, therefore any corresponding or coding information embedded into the document would be invalid and the document in question is a invalid document that would have never been sent to bfelber14@gmail.com.

4) There was no "senior software engineer" who crafted this document, as no "senior software engineer" would crucially leave out that many embeddments.

5) Hibernator Krcmar and Con Artist Hernandez (sorry, its the truth), are the parties more importantly are engaging in the practice of misrepresentation and the indenitfication of a document.

6) There is no direct response with a name of who this "senior software engineer" is therefore, if this document was to be used to examine the Respondent in any purpose or litigation matter whether within the Missouri Public Service Commission, or Circuit Courts themselves, the Complainant wouldn't be able to examine who the "senior software engineer" is.

7) The document in question examines in further detail the business practices that Ameren Missouri is engaging themselves in. Under Missouri Public Service Commission rules, regulations and tariffs customers are to receive fair and just rates, along with business practices. This document violates not only Missouri Statutes under the grounds fo deception, deceiving, forgery, counterfeit documents and misrepresentation.

8) This document in question further examines the business practices of Ameren Missouri under Missouri Public Service Commission rules, regulations and tariffs. Along with business practices.

9) There is no Statute to Cite when examining the Respondent to ask a simple question of is www2.ameren.com, and if it is a valid email address or not.

10) The Statute to Cite only comes in after Ameren Missouri files a clear answer to the question asked. However, Ameren Missouri would further wish to have the matter dismissed instead of a satisfactory investigation as to whether www2.ameren.com is an actual email address. (Which it isn't that is why Ameren's Con Artist Counsel wants the matter dismissed)

11) Ameren Missouri's email address and identification of email address for sending out agreements and notices come from the direct email of DONOTReply@ameren.com

Undersigned Counsel for Ameren Missouri Motion to Dismiss is frivolous and doesn't address key issues in which the Complainant identified as part of the reason for a Change of Supplier. Complainant is entitled under Missouri Public Service Commission rules, regulations and tariffs and more importantly State and Federal Statutes that a business will conduct legal business practices and not unethical, more importantly deceptive and deceiving business practices.

The Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark shouldn't even entertain Respondent, Ameren Missouri's filing for the Motion to Dismiss, more importantly the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark should order Ameren Missouri the Respondent to answer the direct question of if www2.ameren.com is a valid email address or not an email address.

In which the Complainant respectfully asks the Commission and Honorable Judge Clark to Compel Ameren Missouri, one of the Respondents in this matter to supply the identical information such as .

1) Is www2.ameren.com a valid email address.

2) Is DONOTReply@ameren.com Ameren's actual email address for sending documents or notices to customers.

Respondent Ameren Missouri, has failed to comply to answer any of the Complainant's questions asked and would rather rush to dismiss a document that she further knows is a forged copy, but also a counterfeit copy in which is why she wants the matter to be dismissed.

As said earlier, the Complainant respectfully asks the Commission and the Honorable Judge Clark to not only deny Ameren Missouri's frivolous Motion, but to Compel direct answers to questions that the Complainant has asked and file those answers prior to any ruling on a Motion to Dismiss filed by Ameren Missouri.

In addition, I respectfully ask that the Commission and Honorable Judge Clark keep this matter open until Staff of the Commission files their response to this matter ,as I asked Mr. Graham and Mr. Keevil to identify if www2.ameren.com is a valid email address for receiving and sending emails.

However, Respondent Ameren Missouri is failing to comply with identified issues that the Complainant has brought before the Commission in which the Commission has the rights to further investigate under their body of limited powers.

Any relief or Dismissals filed by Ameren Missouri should be denied until the file a response about the surrounding details the Complainant has given to the Commission surrounding their practices.

Brett Felber
March 29, 2024