

EC-2024-0217

Brett Felber
VS
Ameren Missouri

The Complainants Amended complaint regarding the counterfeit document or fraudulent document that was used to misrepresent and defraud the Complainant out of money was never ruled on or no final judgment was handed down by the Commissioners or the Regulatory Judge in EC-2023-0395.

In addition under rule 74.01 (a) there was no final judgment rendered by the Commission, Commissioners or Regulatory Judge in EC-2023-0395, therefore an appeal can't be filed or heard on the matter. A final judgment by the Commission, Commissioners and Regulatory Judge should have issued a final judgment and signed off on a final judgment over a judgment.

Under 74.01 (b) the appellate court has no jurisdiction for an appeal.
(Case reference- Bi-State Development Agency v Peckham, Guyton, Alberts & Viets, Inc 747 S.W. 2d 332, 334 (Mo.App. 1988))

In civil case the judgment becomes final thirty (30) days after the entry of the judgment if no timely motion for a new trial is filed. If a motion for a new trial or rehearing is filed the judgment becomes final at the expiration of ninety (90) days of the motion or disposition. Rule 81.05 (a).

Complainant filed a timely motion on 11/29/2023, thus extending the final judgment timeline to 90 days which would have been 2/29/ 2024. Complainant was denied a re-hearing on 1/10/2024 and timely again filed a motion for re-hearing and or appeal, in which to date the Commissioners have failed to deny and on 3/11/2024, the Commission reopened EC-2023-0395 and haven't closed it to date according to EFIS records. Which further would relapse the period of a final judgment being issued to 5/29/2024 and an order signed off by the Regulatory Judge determining the judgment is final on that date.

Complainant filed a motion to amend their Complaint to include the counterfeit document on 3/9/2024 which is in the legal timeframe to amend the Complaint based off misrepresentation and defrauding a Complainant out of money or a document was utilized to defraud the Complainant.

Under Rule 60 the court may correct a clerical mistake or mistake from oversight or omission Rule (a)

Under Rule 60 (b) Grounds from relief from a Final Judgment, Order or Proceeding

- (1) mistake, inadvertance, surprise, or excusable neglect.
- (2) newly discovered evidence that , with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in new time to move for a new trial or rehearing under Rule 59 (b)
- (3) Fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic) misrepresentation or misconduct by the opposing party.

The document at question contains invalid and bogus email address that Ameren Missouri the opposing party known as the Respondent calls www2.ameren.com an email address. The oppsing party also misrepresents the agreement under the PAG terms instead of numerical value inputs for the amounts as table border, cellpadding,, cellspacing, color, wutable.

The document was used to defraud Mr. Felber out of not only money, but made to resemble a “payment agreement” that was a fraudulent payment agreement with a fraudulent email address.

This qualifies as newly discovered evidence that the Respondent to date has not affirmly filed an answer for . Ameren Missouri, the Respondent doesn't want to file a response to the counterfeit document because they know it was used to defraud and misrepresent the actual payment agreement that Mr. Felber supplied to the Commission.

Such as the actual payment agreement including the actual email address that Ameren uses which is DONOTReply@ameren.com on their actual payment agreements.

The Commission has no authority to dismiss the amended Complaint until they issue a Final Judgment on the matter and EC-2023-0395 still remains open to date and haven't filed a new or final order closing it. Even then. The final judgment wouldn't take affect until 90 days from the actual date of the closing of the order.

The Complainant is entitled to the relief in the form of \$ [REDACTED] being returned to him from the Respondent as a result of misrepresentation and utilization of a fraudulent forgery document that has bogus email addresses and PAG terms.

The Commission should order Respondent Ameren Missouri to respond and file an answer in regards to the Counterfiet document that the Respondent continues to deflect or avoid answering.

In addition, the Commission should order the Respondent to quit harassing the Complainant with insufficient disconnect notices and illegal disconnect notices that don't fall within the timeframe nor meet the 10 day requirment. They should also refrain from further publication or production of other forgery, fraudulent and counterfeit documents they continue to try to utilize or impose to imposter.

Brett Felber
April 28, 2024