

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of:

Brett Felber, Complainant

v.

Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri, Respondent

Case No. **EC-2026-0004**

**LEGAL QUESTION AND NOTICE OF CONCERN BEFORE THE
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

TO:

Nancy Dippell, Secretary of the Commission;

John Clark, Senior Regulatory Law Judge;

Commission Staff Counsel;

Counsel for Ameren Missouri.

LEGAL QUESTION PRESENTED

Complainant respectfully and formally asks the following question for the record before the Missouri Public Service Commission:

When will the Missouri Public Service Commission's Secretary, the Senior Regulatory Law Judge, Commission Staff Counsel, and Ameren Missouri begin to present the truth within their filings, statements, and procedural representations before this tribunal?

The record reflects inconsistencies, misrepresentations, and contradictory positions that obstruct transparency and due process. Rather than correcting prior inaccuracies, successive filings have compounded those inconsistencies, replacing one misstatement with another.

STATEMENT OF CONCERN

Complainant has observed and documented repeated contradictions between written filings and verbal representations made during hearings and prehearing conferences. These discrepancies are inconsistent with the Commission's own rules, regulations, tariffs, and applicable Missouri statutes.

Accordingly, Complainant asks:

What specific Commission Rules, Regulations, Tariffs, and Missouri State Statutes are presently being followed in this proceeding—and which ones are being disregarded?

CLARIFICATION REGARDING FALSE ACCUSATIONS

Any insinuation that Complainant’s filings are “AI-generated” is false, irrelevant, and prejudicial. Such statements distract from the material evidence and statutory issues before the Commission.

Complainant does not require artificial intelligence to identify what is plainly evident in the record—contradictions, omissions, and misstatements originating from Respondent and, at times, from Commission personnel.

CONCLUSION AND REQUEST

Complainant requests a written response on the record clarifying:

- 1) The governing rules, tariffs, and statutes being applied;
- 2) The steps that will be taken to correct the record and ensure truthfulness and consistency in future filings;
- 3) The basis for any prior inconsistent statements that appear in official submissions or hearing representations.

Complainant expects adherence to Chapter 386, RSMo, and 20 CSR 4240-2.010 et seq., and requests prompt clarification.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brett Felber

Brett Felber, Complainant

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Legal Question and Notice of Concern has been served this 9th day of October, 2025, upon:

- [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

via EFIS electronic filing and email per Commission procedures.