



Coincidence? Cyberlux Drops Litigation Update the Same Day a Federal Judge Questions Their Case

Description

Cyberlux Corporation has been playing a dazzling game of legal hopscotch, and if there were awards for corporate stalling tactics, they'd be clearing shelf space. Faced with creditors pounding at the door and judges side-eyeing their every move, Cyberlux has taken a unique approach to problem-solving: don't solve the problem, just move the goalposts until everyone forgets what they were arguing about.

It started in California, where Cyberlux was on the receiving end of an enforcement action from Atlantic Wave Holdings and Secure Community. These companies had already won a judgment against Cyberlux in Virginia and were simply looking to collect. Cyberlux, however, decided that rather than facing the music, they'd rather remix the track. So, like any company with a crack team of legal magicians, they pulled the classic *remove-it-to-federal-court* trick in 2024. The move temporarily yanked the case out of California's hands, presumably in hopes that the added complexity would buy them time. But the federal judge wasn't impressed. Instead of playing along, they issued an Order to Show Cause on February 27, 2025, essentially demanding that Cyberlux explain why the case should remain in federal court at all. In judicial terms, this is the equivalent of saying, **â??The federal government doesn't care, I'm sending this back to California. Pay your damn bills!â??**

Meanwhile, in Texas, a separate legal battle was unfolding. Atlantic Wave Holdings and Secure Community were seeking to enforce the Virginia judgment by appointing a receiver in Harris County to seize Cyberlux's Texas-based assets. Just as a Texas judge was about to grant that request, Cyberlux pulled the exact same trick on February 12, 2025, removing the Texas case to federal court. The timing was so last-minute you could almost hear the frantic fax machine whirring. And just for added drama, a third-party lender, Legalist, swooped in, revealing that Cyberlux owed them a delightful \$7.3 million, with interest stacking up daily like an unpaid tab at an expensive bar. Legalist made it clear they had liens on Cyberlux's assets and weren't about to let some pesky court-appointed receiver get first dibs.

Now, if you're thinking Cyberlux would want to explain itself, perhaps reassure shareholders or demonstrate some fiscal responsibility, you'd be mistaken. Instead, they did what any self-

respecting corporate escape artist would do: they dropped a shiny, distracting press release about a successful military tech demonstration in Asia on February 28, 2025. One moment, the courts are breathing down their necks, and the next, theyâ??re talking about defense contracts and tactical communications. Itâ??s like watching a street magician make your wallet disappear while pointing excitedly at a pigeon.

And just to ensure their version of events gets heard, Cyberlux also released a *litigation* Q&A on February 27, 2025, painting themselves as the misunderstood victim of aggressive creditors. According to them, the Virginia judgment was settled long ago, and they have been diligently complying with a non-disclosed agreement. The Texas and California enforcement actions? Nothing but reckless interference with their thriving business, if you believe their spin. But creditors donâ??t file emergency motions for receivership against companies that are actually keeping up with their obligations.

This isnâ??t just a coincidence. Itâ??s a pattern. Delay, deny, distract. The California removal didnâ??t go as planned? Distract with a PR push. The Texas receiver appointment was imminent? Yank it into federal court before the ink dries. Creditors banging on the door? Pretend itâ??s all a misunderstanding while flashing headlines about high-tech military gear. If the lawsuits are an avalanche, Cyberlux is out here trying to fight it with a snow shovel and a press release.

But the thing about legal stalling tactics is that they only work for so long. Federal judges arenâ??t easily fooled, and the skepticism is already mounting. The California judge is openly questioning whether Cyberlux even belongs in federal court. The Texas case, with its tangled mess of lenders, judgments, and frantic removals, isnâ??t looking much better. **And if a federal judge in California doesnâ??t care, why should a federal judge in Texas care?** Sooner or later, one of these courts is going to call the bluff, and when that happens, no amount of Asia-Pacific tech demos or carefully crafted litigation Q&As will stop the creditors from coming.

Cyberlux isnâ??t playing to win in court. Theyâ??re playing to run out the clock. The real question is, how much time do they think they have left?

[Atlantic_Wave_Holdings_LLC_et_v_Cyberlux_Corporation_casdce-24-00482_0033.0Download](#)

Disclaimer

All posts, articles, and op-eds about Cyberlux Corporation are grounded entirely in information sourced from publicly available court records, government documents, and financial disclosures filed with OTC Markets. This content is intended for informational purposes onlyâ??itâ??s not legal advice, itâ??s not financial guidance, and itâ??s definitely not an invitation to dive headfirst into investment decisions. Our interpretations, opinions, and conclusions stem exclusively from these accessible resources. Ultimate adjudication of legal matters rests with the courts and qualified legal professionals. As always, youâ??re encouraged to verify independently because, letâ??s face it, trust but verify is a motto that never goes out of style. If you believe there is an error in our reporting and have **verifiable** proof, we encourage you to present it, and we will promptly review and address any inaccuracies.

Category

1. Cyberlux

Tags

1. contracts
2. cyberlux
3. factoring
4. FMS
5. Ukraine

Date Created

February 28, 2025

Author

jackson