

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

JONATHAN MILLER,

Complainant,

v.

Spire Missouri Inc. d/b/a Spire,

Respondent.

Case No. GC-2026-0007

MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY AND FOR A SHOW CAUSE ORDER

COMES NOW Complainant, Jonathan Miller, Pro Se, and pursuant to Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, files this Motion to Compel Discovery and for a Show Cause Order. This Motion is in response to Staff's Objection to Data Request 0030 ("Objection") as filed on September 8, 2025. Complainant respectfully requests that the Commission overrule Staff's objections and compel full and complete responses to the propounded Data Requests.

I. BACKGROUND

1. On August 27, 2025, Complainant filed Data Request 0030 ("DR 0030"), which included specific requests to Commission Staff regarding their conduct and procedures in this case.
2. On September 8, 2025, Staff filed an Objection, refusing to provide any of the requested information based on a variety of legal arguments.
3. As demonstrated below, Staff's objections are without merit and appear to be part of a pattern of procedural obstruction designed to impede Complainant's ability to participate meaningfully in this case.

II. ARGUMENT

Staff's objections are unfounded and should be overruled by the Commission.

1. **Relevance to Material Issues (DR 24.1, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4, 26.5, 26.6, 26.7, 26.8, 26.9, 26.10, 26.12):** Staff repeatedly objects that the requests are not "relevant to material issues" in the case. For example, regarding DR 26.12, Staff objects because it is "not relevant to material issues brought in Complainant's original complaint." This objection is frivolous and misrepresents the nature of the Complainant's formal complaint. Complainant's initial complaint explicitly raised issues with the conduct of PSC representatives and the procedural handling of the case. The Commission's own rules, **20 CSR 4240-2.090(2)**, permit discovery "regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action." The subject

matter of this action includes not only Spire's conduct but also the conduct of the PSC and its Staff, which is a core part of the complaint.

2. **Privilege (DR 24.1, 24.2, 24.3, 24.4, 24.5, 25.1, 25.2):** Staff claims various documents and statements are protected by "work product" and "attorney-client privilege." These objections are without merit. The requests seek information about internal policies and procedures, which are not protected. Furthermore, the requests are for factual information, not legal opinions. Staff has failed to provide a specific, non-conclusory log of privileged documents.
3. **Premature and Subject to Investigation (DR 24.2, 24.3, 24.4, 24.5, 25.1, 26.11):** Staff objects that the requests "prematurely" seek information that will be addressed in an upcoming report. For example, regarding DR 26.12, Staff objects because "It prematurely seeks information that is the subject of an investigation." This is a classic delaying tactic. Complainant has a right to the requested information through discovery now, not at Staff's convenience. The fact that Staff is conducting an investigation is not a valid basis to deny a discovery request.
4. **Public Information (DR 24.1, 25.2, 26.3, 26.4, 26.5, 26.8, 26.9, 26.10, 26.11, 26.12):** Staff objects that some requests seek "public information equally accessible by Complainant." For example, regarding DR 26.12, Staff objects because "It seeks public information equally accessible to Complainant." This is a misleading objection. While some documents may be public, Complainant has a right to have Staff identify and provide specific documents relevant to the case, rather than forcing Complainant to search through the entire EFIS system.
5. **Argumentative, Vague, Ambiguous, Overly Broad, and Burdensome (DR 24.0, 24.2, 24.4, 24.5, 25.0, 26.0, 26.11):** These generic objections are a common tactic to avoid providing information. For example, Staff objects that DR 24.0 is "argumentative." The requests are clear and specific. Staff's use of these objections appears to be an attempt to obstruct discovery without valid reason.

III. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Complainant, Jonathan Miller, respectfully requests that the Commission:

- a) **OVERRIDE** Staff's objections and **COMPEL** Staff to provide full and complete responses to all of the Data Requests in question within ten (10) business days.
- b) **ORDER** Staff to **SHOW CAUSE** why they should not be sanctioned for their pattern of obstructionist behavior, which includes, but is not limited to, the filing of an unmerited objection letter that serves no purpose but to impede the discovery process and frustrate the Complainant.
- c) **GRANT** such other and further relief as the Commission deems just and reasonable.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan L. Miller

Complainant, Pro Se

Account Number: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: September 8, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE The undersigned certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon all parties of record in this matter via electronic filing through the Electronic Filing and Information System (EFIS) on this

8th

day of

September

, 2025.

Jonathan L. Miller Complainant, Pro Se