



How a Federal Contract Gave Cover to a Years-Long Promotion Scheme

Description

It began, as these things often do, with timing that felt just a little too precise to be innocent.

At 9:27 AM on May 9, 2025, an article about TrellisWare went live. Not explosive. Not theatrical. Just careful enough to be uncomfortable. The kind of reporting that doesn't accuse so much as it rearranges the room and lets everyone notice what no longer lines up.

SOF Week had closed the night before. Cyberlux had spent four days in Tampa doing what companies like to call storytelling and what everyone else quietly recognizes as selling a version of reality that hasn't quite arrived yet.

Seventy-six minutes later, at 10:43 AM on May 9, 2025, a StockTwits account called Sassybitch posted for the first time.

Not about the article. Not directly. A warm-up line: "CYBL paid service hmmm."

Two minutes later, a Cyberlux press release. Eighteen minutes after that, the tone sharpened. By mid-afternoon, the persona was fully formed, introducing itself to the community with the kind of casual hostility that signals familiarity, not discovery.

Seventy-six minutes is too fast for an organic reaction. It is, however, exactly fast enough for something that was already waiting.

And once it started, it didn't hesitate. The progression wasn't chaotic. It was structured. Mockery, then positioning, then authority. A character assembled in public, piece by piece, as though the outline had already been drafted somewhere else.

You can call that coincidence. Markets are full of coincidences.

But then you look backward.

Back in September 2021, the account had already been registered. Quietly. Four years before it ever spoke.

September 2021 is not just a timestamp. It is the point where the pieces first appear together.

Cyberlux references "Operation Alpha" in its annual report. In the same period, Cyberlux and RB Capital enter into a convertible debt arrangement, reshaping the capital structure that would later underpin the share activity that follows. And, sitting alongside both of those developments, an account is created that will remain silent for nearly four years.

Not in marketing language, but in filings where companies are required to explain how they intend to remain solvent. That matters, because companies tend to be more honest when they are legally obligated to be.

In that same quarter, shares were moving in ways that, individually, might pass without comment. Together, they begin to form a pattern. CTMC Drone Solutions acquired at the end of August. FBD Group, a modest Albanian firm, assigned a valuation that sits uneasily against its prior financials. Fifty million shares issued to a city attorney as part of a debt settlement. The OTC Exchange later adding that same attorney to its list of prohibited service providers.

Names repeat. Blocks of shares move in familiar sizes. Labels shift slightly depending on where you look, but the structure underneath stays recognizably the same.

By December 31, 2021, Cyberlux had 5.75 billion shares outstanding, a jump of 247 million in a single quarter.

It stops looking like noise. It starts to look like activity.

And sitting quietly alongside all of it, an account that would not speak for nearly four years.

You don't usually build something like this after the problem appears. You build it before, when you already suspect one is coming.

Fast forward to May 2025, and the sequence tightens.

Phase one begins at 9:27 AM on May 9, 2025. The TrellisWare article lands the morning after SOF Week, asking a question about whether a defence communications company being referenced in Cyberlux materials actually acknowledged the relationship being suggested.

At 10:43 AM on May 9, 2025, Sassybitch activates. Seventy-six minutes later.

Phase two arrives the following morning, May 10, 2025. Bill Maadarani, Cyberlux's Chief Revenue Officer, sends a text message under his own name. Not a denial. Not a clarification. Something else entirely.

"I waited in silence, no sound, not a peep! With patience I struck, and you didn't see."

It reads like performance. Or celebration. Or both. It suggests watching. It suggests timing. It suggests a belief that something has already been executed successfully.

The message is timestamped. It sits in evidence. It doesn't need interpretation so much as it invites it.

Phase three arrives on May 27, 2025.

A second account, RacketeerX, publishes a structured doxxing package on X. Not a thread thrown together in anger. Something compiled. Footnoted. The kind of work that takes time and then appears all at once, fully assembled.

Public pressure runs on one channel. Private messages run on another. Two fronts, same moment.

And on that day, Sassybitch goes quiet. Not gone. Just absent.

If you've spent any time watching coordinated campaigns, that detail has a particular texture. You don't crowd your own narrative. You let the loudest piece of the operation take the stage.

The following morning, May 28, 2025, at 6:37 AM, Sassybitch returns, translating the narrative into something softer, more accessible. The same framework, reframed. A relay rather than a coincidence.

Eighteen days. Three phases. Clean sequencing.

Not impossible for independent actors. But it doesn't feel independent.

Because the account itself doesn't behave like a person. It behaves like a system wearing a person's voice.

And more than that, the account doesn't exist in isolation.

It sits alongside a cluster of other aliases that appear in the same general window, September 2021, each with its own tone, its own rhythm, its own role in the conversation.

Sassybitch is just one of them.

On its own, it can be read as a single voice that shifts depending on the moment. But placed next to the others, the pattern changes. The differences in tone don't feel accidental. They feel assigned.

One account leans into confrontation. Another builds narrative. Another reframes and reinforces. Different voices, different styles, but all circling the same set of claims, the same company, the same pressure points.

Over time, they begin to move less like individuals and more like parts of the same effort. Not identical. Not synchronized in every moment. But aligned.

And that alignment traces back to the same starting point, the same time frame, and the same underlying objective tied to Operation Alpha and the broader promotion surrounding it.

Sassybitch, in that context, stops being the story on its own. It becomes one piece of a much larger pattern.

Most of the time, it speaks fluently in the language of retail forums. Casual. Combative. Familiar. Exactly what you would expect. That's the mask.

But occasionally, the tone shifts. Legal arguments appear that are not yet visible in public reporting. Strategic interpretations of court developments that align closely with the interests of one side of active litigation.

That's not definitive. People can be informed. People can be perceptive. But patterns matter. And repetition sharpens them.

By December 2025, months after the initial activation sequence, the system falters.

Posts appear across multiple tickers as loops. Repeated. Garbled. Identical errors, same morning, different contexts. Not a bad day. Not a typo. A malfunction.

For a moment, the voice disappears, and what remains looks less like a person and more like infrastructure.

By the end of December 2025, the account reaches its highest output. Eighty posts.

At that point, the journalist it had been built to engage had been silent since the end of July 2025. No articles. No posts. Nothing to respond to.

There was nothing new to engage. No catalyst. No trigger.

And still, the activity continues, not reactive but sustained, without a visible external cause.

When the journalist returns in early March 2026, after more than four months of silence, the tone changes again.

On March 18, 2026, the account characterizes a procedural development in Greensboro as something that "stops the legal discovery process." That is not how a typical retail investor reads a docket entry. It is how someone with a stake might.

On March 21, 2026, the account publishes an argument about whether a pseudonymous persona can claim damages tied to investigative work. That framing is not widely circulating in public discourse. It is, however, the kind of argument that appears in conversations between counsel and client before it reaches a courtroom.

This is no longer just volume, but positioning, deliberate and increasingly aligned with the language and framing of active legal strategy.

Alongside that shift, a parallel version of reality continues to take shape.

On January 6, 2026, it references "feedback from 2,000+ drones delivered to the US Department of Defense." The contract for those drones had been cancelled. A Stop Work Order issued months earlier. No verified deliveries.

There is no feedback from equipment that was never built.

On March 21, 2026, the account publishes six posts describing Cyberlux's presence at World Defense Show in Riyadh. Closed-door meetings. Strategic positioning. Institutional access.

Cyberlux was not officially registered as a participant.

One post like that might be enthusiasm. Dozens begin to look like construction.

Which brings everything back to the question that sits underneath the narrative.

Because accounts, systems, and stories don't exist in isolation. They sit inside structures. And structures are built, maintained, and overseen by people.

Cyberlux, at the time, had less than \$20,000 in the bank. It carried a Caveat Emptor designation. It had active IRS liens. It had no visible presence at SOF Week year after year.

And yet, HII Mission Technologies awarded it tens of millions of dollars.

A company with less than \$20,000 in the bank was handed tens of millions of dollars.

That decision now sits in federal court, alongside a question that has not been fully answered in public filings: what due diligence preceded it?

At the center of the company is Mark D. Schmidt.

In a sworn declaration, he states that he makes the final decisions on all major aspects of Cyberlux's operations. Investments. Contracts. Manufacturing. Everything above \$100,000 requires his approval.

He owns the decisions.

Around him are the mechanisms that are supposed to provide oversight.

A lawyer who also held shares. A city attorney whose taxpayers funded legal work connected to the company. A contractor writing checks of extraordinary size relative to the company's financial position. A court-appointed receiver whose role was to supervise, later accused of conspiracy by the man he was meant to oversee.

Individually, each of these relationships can be explained. Together, they begin to resemble something else.

Oversight, in theory, is simple. Someone watches. Someone asks questions. Someone says no when the answers don't make sense.

Here, every layer that should have provided friction either aligned, benefited, or was challenged the moment it attempted to function.

And when questions began to surface publicly, the response was not clarity. It was activity, persistent and structured, timed closely enough to matter.

That absence of scrutiny does not sit in a vacuum.

RB Capital and its principals, Brett and Deborah Rosen, have since been indicted in San Diego in connection with an alleged stock promotion scheme involving Cyberlux.

So you sit with the record. The filings. The timestamps. The messages. The gaps.

With the credibility of a \$78.8 million contract, distracting investors and others from reality was simple for entities like sassybitch. She just needed to make everything and everyone else easier to dismiss.

If Mark Schmidt says he was responsible for everything, and if his lawyer had a stake, and if his contractor funded the operation, and if his oversight mechanism was neutralized when it acted, then the question is not just what happened.

The question remains; Who was watchingâ??and why did they allow this continue in plain view?

Disclaimer

All articles and commentary regarding Cyberlux Corporation are based entirely on information drawn from publicly available sources, including court records, government documents, and financial disclosures filed with OTC Markets. The content presented here is intended solely for informational and analytical purposes and should not be interpreted as legal advice, financial advice, or investment guidance.

Any interpretations, opinions, or conclusions expressed reflect analysis of these publicly available materials. Determinations regarding legal matters ultimately rest with the courts and appropriate authorities.

Readers are encouraged to independently verify information and conduct their own research. If you believe any reporting contains an error and can provide verifiable documentation, we welcome the opportunity to review and promptly correct any inaccuracies.

Category

1. Cyberlux
2. Featured

Date Created

March 22, 2026

Author

jackson