

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Cheri Meadows,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	Case No. EC-2025-0136
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Grain Belt Express LLC,)	
)	
Respondent)	

**GRAIN BELT EXPRESS LLC’S SUR-REPLY TO MEADOWS’ REPLY TO GRAIN
BELT’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO LATE-FILED EXHIBITS**

Grain Belt Express LLC (“Grain Belt Express”) hereby files this Sur-Reply to Ms. Meadows’ October 3, 2025 *Response to Grain Belt Express’ Opposition to Late-Filed Exhibits* (“Reply”). In support of its Sur-Reply, Grain Belt Express states as follows:

1. An evidentiary hearing was held in this matter on August 20, 2025. On September 11, 2025, Ms. Meadows filed eight new late-filed exhibits. Grain Belt Express timely filed its response in opposition to the late-filed exhibits on September 24, 2025, the same day reply briefing on the substance of the evidentiary hearing was due and filed by the parties.

2. On October 3, 2025, Ms. Meadows filed her Reply. The Reply contains various assertions as to why the evidence was not offered at the evidentiary hearing, the primary reason being that she did not want to pay to print exhibit copies (a required and necessary activity to afford parties the opportunity to view, challenge and respond to potential evidence). Ms. Meadows’ Reply also contained numerous new arguments regarding the purported relevance of those exhibits.

3. In accordance with 20 CSR 4240-2.150(1), the evidentiary record in this proceeding is now closed and the record of this case has been submitted for the Commission’s consideration

as of September 24, 2025, the date reply briefs were filed in this matter. Ms. Meadows' Reply was not accompanied by a motion to reopen the record, as required by 20 CSR 4240-2.110(8), and her additional late-filed arguments in support of her late-filed exhibits should be disregarded by the Commission.

4. Grain Belt Express stands on its prior objections to the late-filed exhibits on both procedural, relevancy, and hearsay grounds. Ms. Meadows' attempt to supplement her late-filed exhibits with out-of-time briefing and new argument underscores the procedural impropriety of allowing additional exhibits after the close of the evidentiary record. If the Commission ever hopes to conclude this proceeding, it should deny admission of the late-filed exhibits and give no weight to Ms. Meadows' out-of-time briefing and arguments. To the extent Ms. Meadows continues to make evidentiary arguments subsequent to the close of the evidentiary record, Grain Belt Express lodges a standing objection to such future pleadings.

WHEREFORE, Grain Belt respectfully requests that the Commission deny admission of the late-filed exhibits and disregard and give no weight to Ms. Meadows' October 3, 2025 Reply.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI PC

/s/ Anne E. Callenbach

Anne E. Callenbach MBN 56028

Andrew O. Schulte MBN 62194

Sean Pluta MBN 70300

Polsinelli PC

900 W. 48th Place, Suite 900

Kansas City, MO 64112

Telephone: (816) 572-4760

Facsimile: (816) 817-6496

acallenbach@polsinelli.com

aschulte@polsinelli.com

spluta@polsinelli.com

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon all parties of record by email or U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this 7th day of October, 2025.

/s/ Anne E. Callenbach

Attorney for Respondents