

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. EC-2026-0004

BRETT FELBER, Complainant

v.

AMEREN MISSOURI, Respondent

LETTER OF STANDING FIRM ON POSITION AND STANCE

Complainant Brett Felber hereby submits this Letter of Standing Firm on his position and stance before the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission"), regarding ongoing matters in the above-referenced case.

1. Standing Firm on Position and Factual Record

The Complainant stands firm on his position, exhibits, and filings that have been made to this Commission. Each motion and submission is based upon verified factual records, statutory provisions, and documented evidence that demonstrate procedural and legal deficiencies in the handling of this matter by both Ameren Missouri and certain Commission officials.

2. False Narrative of "Threats"

At no point has the Complainant ever threatened any individual or entity associated with these proceedings. It has become a common deflection tactic, by both Ameren Missouri and the Commission, to mischaracterize the Complainant's legal and procedural assertions as "threats" whenever he demands accountability or cites specific laws and regulations. Upon review of various Commission complaint filings involving Ameren Missouri and Administrative Law Judge John Clark since 2023, this pattern appears consistent—Complainants are frequently labeled as "threatening" for exercising lawful procedural rights. Filing motions, citing case law, and invoking statutory provisions does not constitute intimidation. It is the lawful act of a citizen and business entity pursuing justice through established legal mechanisms. Further, Complainant's pending lawsuit against Ameren Missouri (Case No. 2022SC002427, Sangamon County, Illinois) in the amount of \$ [REDACTED], is a legitimate legal claim, not a "threat."

It is apparent that the Commission, Judge John Clark, and Ameren Missouri have a word manipulation problem. Decisively, they choose to alter the definition of statutory and procedural terms—manipulating them into whatever interpretation best fits their desired outcome, rather than adhering to what those laws actually state. I am tired of the Commission's lies, including the false claim of "threats." I don't make threats—I file complaints. There's a big difference, and the record reflects that distinction clearly. I will recourse my money through proper legal channels. And since the Commission appears intent on protecting Ameren, and Judge John Clark communicates with Ameren's Counsel, Mrs. Jennifer Hernandez, quite frequently, perhaps the Commission can inquire how Ameren Missouri intends to satisfy its delinquent debt owed to me in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].

3. Alleged Misrepresentation by Judge Clark

Complainant asserts that Judge John Clark made false and misleading statements in open discussion regarding the existence of the above-referenced lawsuit, despite clear

documentation showing its active status. Such misrepresentation constitutes serious procedural misconduct under Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.010(12)(A), as well as 5 U.S.C. § 556(d). The Complainant stands fully prepared to proceed through litigation to collect the \$ [REDACTED] owed and to pursue all lawful remedies available for the damages resulting from this misconduct.

4. Defective Subpoena and Interstate Jurisdictional Violations

The Complainant further states his intention to press formal criminal charges against Judge John Clark and any involved Commission officials for authorizing or facilitating the transmission of a defective, undomesticated administrative subpoena across state lines, without judicial authorization or certification by a court of competent jurisdiction. Under both Missouri and California law, such conduct violates multiple statutes, including but not limited to:

- California Penal Code § 134–137 – False evidence and fraudulent documents
- California Code of Civil Procedure § 2029.300–2029.600 (UIDDA)
- Missouri Revised Statutes § 491.100, § 491.230
- Missouri Revised Statutes § 610.100 et seq.
- 15 U.S.C. § 6801 et seq. (Gramm–Leach–Bliley Act)
- 12 U.S.C. §§ 3401–3422 (Right to Financial Privacy Act)

5. Demand for Clarification – Deadline November 7, 2025

The Complainant hereby demands that Judge John Clark, Commission Secretary Nancy Dippell, and Ameren Missouri provide a written, filed response to the following questions no later than 5:00 PM, Friday, November 7, 2025:

- 1) What court of competent jurisdiction authorized Mrs. Dippell, Judge Clark, and Ameren Missouri to transmit an administrative subpoena across state lines without proper domestication?
- 2) Why did the Commission authorize and disguise a defective administrative subpoena as a judicial subpoena without a judge's signature or a clerk's seal?
- 3) What court or statute explicitly authorizes the MOPSC, Mrs. Dippell, Judge Clark, or Ameren Missouri to violate the FRPA, MRFPA, and CRFPA?

6. Conclusion

The Complainant stands unwavering in his factual, legal, and procedural position. The record reflects a pattern of abuse of discretion, concealment of administrative misconduct, and disregard for statutory compliance. The Complainant will continue to pursue all lawful remedies, including civil and criminal filings, to ensure accountability and uphold the rule of law.

Respectfully submitted,

Brett Felber

Complainant

Case No. EC-2026-0004

Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email:



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Letter of Standing Firm on Position and Stance was served upon all parties of record via electronic mail and/or EFIS filing system on this 6th day of November, 2025.

By: _____

Brett Felber