

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

At a session of the Public Service Commission held at its office in Jefferson City on the 11th day of January, 2017.

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Diamond Snider, |) | |
| |) | |
| Complainant, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | <u>Case No. EC-2017-0111</u> |
| |) | |
| Union Electric Company, |) | |
| d/b/a Ameren Missouri |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS

Issue Date: January 11, 2017

Effective Date: February 10, 2017

This complaint was filed on October 11, 2016, due to disputed charges for arrearages and the disconnection of the Complainant's service. The Complainant provided information supporting her dispute of certain charges resulting in disconnection of her service. After the receipt of all information and investigation, Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri (Ameren Missouri) determined that sufficient documentation had been provided to remove a substantial amount of the arrearage from Complainant's account. In addition, according to Ameren Missouri, the Complainant paid the undisputed amounts and her service was reconnected. The timeline of events and details regarding the arrearages, disconnection, payment,

removal of certain charges, and reconnection of service are set out in the pleading filed by Ameren Missouri on November 10, 2016.

On November 10, 2016, Ameren Missouri filed a motion to dismiss because the matter had been resolved. Additionally, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) filed a report indicating that although Staff was unable to reach the Complainant, the Consumer Services Division Staff confirmed with Ameren Missouri that some of the charges were removed, the remaining charges were paid, and the Complainant's service was restored.

The Commission issued an order on November 22, 2016, allowing the Complainant until December 9, 2016 to file a response to the motion to dismiss. Additionally, the Commission informed the Complainant that if no response was received the Commission dismissal of the Complaint might be forthcoming. The Complainant did not respond to the motion to dismiss or the Staff's report.

Since the Complainant has failed to respond to the requested motion to dismiss or any Commission order, the Commission determines that the Complaint should be dismissed.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The Complaint filed on October 11, 2016 is dismissed

2. This order shall become effective on February 10, 2017.



BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Morris L. Woodruff".

Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary

Hall, Chm., Stoll, Kenney,
Rupp, and Coleman, CC., concur.

Dippell, Regulatory Law Judge