

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

EC-2026-0004

FILED
September 18, 2025
Missouri Public
Service Commission

BRETT FELBER, Complainant

v.

AMEREN MISSOURI, Respondent

FORMAL COMPLAINT LETTER OF RECORD

Comes now, the Complainant, Brett Felber, and respectfully submits this Formal Complaint Letter of Record before the Missouri Public Service Commission, Commissioners, Staff, and the Respondent, Ameren Missouri. In support thereof, the following is stated:

1. The Complainant understood the process to require stating precise facts and presenting documents to prove the case and to establish the truth.
2. If telephone logs, audio recordings, documented times and dates, forensic data establishing document manipulation, and email correspondence are excluded from the record, the Complainant is unable to adequately expose the flaws and gaps in the Respondent ' s position.
3. To date, the Respondent has failed to provide a single requested document, telephone record, or treasury record. The Complainant ' s Motion to Compel remains unanswered, and additional discovery requests served upon the Respondent last week remain outstanding.
4. The Complainant has not engaged in any outbursts. The Complainant merely stated that documents appeared to be altered or manipulated from their original wording. If such words caused offense, the Complainant apologizes. However, truthful statements should not cause offense if no wrongdoing occurred.
5. The central dispute concerns a particular document. Pursuant to commercial banking regulations, that document cannot be disclosed without the execution of a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA), notwithstanding the existence of a subpoena.
6. Missouri ' s Right to Financial Privacy Act (RSMo § § 408.675–408.700) requires that financial institutions may only disclose customer financial records to government authorities through strict statutory procedures, including customer notice (§ 408.683) and controlled delivery of records (§ 408.687).

7. Further, Missouri law prohibits secondary transfer of obtained financial records except as explicitly authorized (§ 408.689, RSMo).

8. The Missouri Division of Finance is bound by confidentiality requirements in § 361.080, RSMo, which specifically provides that disclosure of sensitive financial information must occur under confidentiality agreements with redaction protocols. This demonstrates Missouri ' s public policy favoring agreements such as NDAs when financial records are disclosed.

9. Missouri PSC Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.135 likewise establishes that while Commission proceedings are generally public, confidential information is recognized and must be handled under protective procedures.

10. Case law confirms this principle: in State ex rel. Ford Motor Co. v. Manners, 239 S.W.3d 583 (Mo. banc 2007), the Missouri Supreme Court upheld non-sharing protective orders. Similarly, in State ex rel. Upjohn Co. v. Dalton, 829 S.W.2d 83 (Mo. App. 1992), Missouri courts approved protective measures limiting the dissemination of sensitive documents.

11. Federal authority, including the Right to Financial Privacy Act, 12 U.S.C. § 3403, also reinforces the need for NDAs or equivalent safeguards before disclosure of financial records. While this federal law applies directly to federal agencies, its procedures mirror those adopted in Missouri law and provide persuasive guidance.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Felber
September 16, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the Commission, Commissioners, Staff, and Ameren Missouri on this 16th day of September, 2025.

Brett Felber