

EC-2024-0217

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

Also Rule 60 provides relief from a Judgment or order.

(A) Based on clerical mistakes , oversights, Omissions

(1) Mistake, inadvertances, surprise or excusable neglect. (Such as the counterfeit document)

(2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence could not have been discovered in time for a new trial under Rule 59 (b). (The document at question, which is a countefeit document was sent to the Complainant 2 days prior to an evidentiary hearing) A document or "payment agreement" that the Complainant asked for the Commission to Compel from Ameren Missouri prior to any evidenitary hearing.

(3) Fraud whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation or misconduct by the opposing party. (The opposing party committed fraud when they submitted a counterfeit document with a bogus email address or a non-existent email address, in which the document is a counterfeit that would have never been sent to the Complainant.)

c.Timing and the Effect of the Motion

A motion under Rule 60 (B) must be made within a reasonable time and for reasons (1), (2) and (3) no more than a year after the entry of the judgment or order the date of the proceeding.

Motions submitted by the Complainant are well under the year threshold and fraud arises out of the document under (1), (2) & (3 of the body of the rule.

To date or since informing the Respondent, the Respondent has made no filings available or answers available in question of the document, itself.

Respondent's filing is another filing in which they again want the help of the Commission and want to continue further breaking the law in this matter. It's a counterfeit document period. Respondent has filed nothing or filed no answer disputing the validation of the document at question.

That's because the Respondent and furthermore, undersigned Counsel knows the exhibit or document brought to the attention to the Commission involves fraud and the Respondent wants to further break the law and commit further fraudulent actions in this matter.

Respondent has no interest in returning the money they extorted from the Complainant as a result of a countefeit document. The PSC itself is allowing the Respondent to not only breach matters, create a barrier of criminal matters, such as illegal disconnections, reproduction and production of counterfeit documents, extortion, theft of funds, property damage. Failure to report property damage and leaving the scene of property damage, etc.

The Complainant has given the Respondent numerous opportunities to respond. The Respondent even boldy flat out lied to not only the Complainant, but the Commission itself, when they stated they would file an answer or response to the document in question. They had two requests to extend the time.

Knowing that an answer was due on the subject of www2.ameren.com and the validation of an email address, the Respondent didn't file an answer, like they said and were told to. They completely ignored filing an answer and instead filed a Motion to Dismiss the matter.

The Respondent cannot be trusted any longer and their credibility is essentially broken. They are coniving thieves who have stolen money and damaged personal property of the Complainant and further more illegal disconnected utility services prior to an arranged date of May 22, 2023 and boldly submitted a counterfeit and fraudulent non-existent "payment agreement" to not only the Commission, but the Complainant.

In addition, they furthermore continued the fraudulent actions when they boldly labeled the document in the words of "senior software engineer" who stated this. There was no "senior software engineer" that made this counterfeit document, it was a document crafted by Banks Law LLC, Jermaine Grubbs (Prior Counsel) and Aubrey Krcmar. That's why they don't want to give any names of "senior software engineers" because there was no senior software engineer involved in the document in question . Way too many mistakes and fraudulent actions in the document.

However, the Respondent is completely wrong. A document that is fraudulent and used to defraud a party doesn't have to go through an appeal, it can be challenged and the matter can simply be reopened based on cerlical mistakes during the course.

Plus the document was never questioned or brought up in EC-2023-0395, at all.

Respondent knows they committed fraud and it's a counterfeit document, but they don't want to admit that it is a counterfeit document, because it involves an illegal disconnection and further more reimbursing and repaying the Complainant over \$ [REDACTED] that is owed to the Complainant, plus other damages.

Brett Felber
April 22, 2024