



How Cyberlux Took a Court Stay and Made it Pay.

Description

On June 30, 2025, the First Court of Appeals in Houston pressed pause. It issued a stay on the receivership that had gripped Cyberlux Corporation—a legal breather, not a get-out-of-chaos-free card. The court told the receiver to stand down, but it didn’t dissolve him. It didn’t restore order. What it did was give the company room to move. And Cyberlux moved like someone who knows the alarm’s about to go back on.

In the five days that followed, the company filed two UCC liens. One came cloaked behind a faceless corporate alias. The other arrived swinging a legal bat. Then, on July 8—one day after the second filing—Cyberlux popped back up on social media, beaming about \$24.5 million in Q2 revenue and a growing defense backlog. No mention of the liens. No hint of debt. Just a cheery financial selfie and a wink.



What happened during those five days wasn't a coincidence. It was choreography. The first filing hit on July 2. The secured party? CHTD Company.

Sounds like a lender, right? It's not. CHTD is an alias for Corporation Service Company (CSC), a firm whose core business is making sure nobody knows who's really doing business. On its own website, CSC offers "secured party representation" for clients who want to file a lien but don't want their name on it. Think of it as a legal ski mask. So someone still unnamed filed a lien against all of Cyberlux's present and future assets. No loan terms disclosed. No partners announced. Just a blanket claim filed while the court was on mute. If this was ordinary financing, why hide?

Five days later, on July 7, a second lien landed. This one came from APP Funding Beta LLC, a real but discreet financing firm based in New York. They specialize in speed. No fluff. Just capital, collateral, and control. Their filing didn't bother with subtlety. It claimed everything—receivables, inventory, equipment, IP, even proceeds from future assets. And it came with legal barbed wire: a warning that any attempt to file further liens could amount to tortious interference. Translation: if you try to cut in line, we sue. APP Funding operates like a hard money lender in a fintech hoodie. Quick, quiet, and ready to enforce.

Here's where it gets artful: June 30, the appellate court grants a stay. July 2, CHTD Company files its lien. July 3, the last full business day before a three-day federal holiday. July 4-6, everything shuts down. July 7, APP Funding files its lien. July 8, Cyberlux tweets about revenue. Five calendar days. Two holidays. Two liens. One carefully timed press release. This wasn't just opportunism—it was a legal sprint.

The day after both filings were in, Cyberlux took to Twitter and declared its Q2 victory: \$24.5 million in revenue, \$29.6 million YTD, and an \$18.1 million backlog. No mention of the fact that its assets had just been claimed from two directions like someone staking out a parking space with lawn chairs and caution tape. According to the court-appointed receiver, this same company had no daily operations, no access to its last facility, no paid staff, and one foot out the door. In his words: “There are no known daily operations” for the Receiver to disturb or with which to interfere. Yet here was Cyberlux, spinning a victory lap.

At the center of all this is a single number: \$25,795,303.38. That’s the amount Cyberlux is set to receive from HII Mission Technologies. It’s their last known asset. And it’s been held in escrow, waiting for the court to sort out who’s actually entitled to it. The receiver says this money is the only thing standing between a potential creditor payout and a vanishing act. With the liens in place, both APP Funding and the mystery lender behind CHTD now have legal claims on that payout. The risk, as the receiver warned, is that the court’s pause lets Cyberlux position itself to walk away with the bag before anyone else touches it.

Cyberlux hasn’t said a word about the newly minted liens. No transparency. No lender named behind CHTD. No explanation of whether this was funding for growth or just a pre-emptive grab. If these were operational loans, they were executed with cloak-and-dagger precision. If they weren’t, then someone just joined the cue of creditors.

The stay was never a reset. It was a window. Cyberlux appears to have used it with efficiency. And when the court presses play again, we’ll find out whether the money’s still there or whether someone already slipped out the side door with it.

[Read the July 2nd UCCDownload](#)

[Read the July 7th UCCDownload](#)

Disclaimer

All posts, articles, and op-eds about Cyberlux Corporation and individuals associated with or formerly affiliated with the company are grounded entirely in information sourced from publicly available court records, government documents, financial disclosures filed with OTC Markets, and firsthand communications received by the author. This content reflects journalistic interpretation and opinion based on those materials. It is not legal advice, financial guidance, or an endorsement of any investment strategy.

Any references to specific conduct or behavior are presented in the context of public interest reporting, and all conclusions drawn are derived from verifiable, accessible evidence. **Any characterizations of motive, strategy, or intent are speculative and based solely on publicly observable timing, language, and conduct—not insider knowledge.** Ultimate legal determinations belong to courts and licensed legal professionals. Readers are encouraged to conduct independent verification because trust but verify never goes out of style.

If you believe there is an error in our reporting and can provide verifiable documentation to that effect, we welcome your feedback and will promptly review and correct any substantiated inaccuracies.

Category

1. Cyberlux

Tags

- 1. cyberlux
- 2. Ukraine

Date Created

July 17, 2025

Author

jackson