



If Cyberlux is So Right â?? Why Do They Keep Losing?

Description

This article is a direct response to claims that Cyberlux Corporation faces only minor legal exposure. The court record paints a very different picture.

Before we dive into filings and defaults, letâ??s remember how we got here: a [whistleblower email](#) that was never meant for public view. It came from someone who valued his own reputationâ??and that of his companyâ??more than the lure of partnership. That message didnâ??t just crack the narrative. It reminded us that due diligence means more than reading press releases. It means watching what a company actually does.

Introduction: The Tweet That Sparked This

On May 17, 2025, a user calling himself @jamestheright1 responded to a comment about Cyberlux Corporationâ??s legal exposure with a tweet:



JamesTheRight  @jamestheright1 · 2h



Atlantic Wave is ongoing but pre-dates the new company mission and direction. Plus it's in the statements as likely being resolved in favor of CYBL. But you are correct, that one is outstanding. I ignore it as it is
a) SMALL relatively speaking
b) likely to resolve in CYBL favor

RB Capital (Brett) they have agreement but need to sign
The only other one is a \$200k lawsuit from Aerotek. Again with \$5-30m in revenues a qtr, I am not looking at that one to derail the path.

The major ones were the large contract and RB.

Finally, I am not ignoring note M which is the non-payment of a loan and required re-negotiating of the terms. That to me is the biggest red flag remaining as cash balance has, in the past, been an issue.



24



It's a perfect encapsulation of the misinformation loop surrounding Cyberlux: minimize, reframe, deflect.

According to James, all but one lawsuit is "small".

This is the same guy who, not long ago, asked me for nudes in a public thread then deleted it and apologized. So while his judgment may have improved, his legal analysis hasn't.

The facts tell a different story—one of default judgments, garnishments, federal tax liens, multiple remands, and over a dozen active and historical cases.

This article isn't about dunking on anonymous defenders. It's about confronting the reality distortion field that keeps penny stock grift alive long after the filings should have shut it down.

Let's go to the docket.

The Myth of "One Outstanding Case"

If you're told there's only one outstanding case against Cyberlux, ask: which one?

The one in Virginia where a judgment was already entered?

The one in California that was dismissed without prejudice?

Or the second California case they removed and lost again?

Maybe it's the Texas case filed to domesticate the Virginia judgment, removed to federal court, remanded, and removed again. That one was sent back too. The judge awarded attorneys' fees to the plaintiffs.

Or perhaps they mean one of the ten garnishment sub-filings from the original Virginia case, trying to intercept payments from vendors, distributors, and third-party payers.

Wait—there's more.

Cyberlux also filed two separate cases in Virginia against Atlantic Wave themselves. They failed to prosecute either.

And now Atlantic Wave has filed a new, active case in Virginia over stock obligations arguing Cyberlux breached a settlement tied to publicly traded shares.

So if there's only one case left! it's a choose-your-own delusion situation. Because in reality, this isn't a single lawsuit—it's a legal ecosystem. And Cyberlux is losing in every direction.

Other Judgments and Defaults

Let's get out of the Atlantic Wave orbit for a moment because even if you ignore all those filings, Cyberlux's legal rap sheet is still stacked.

In April 2025, Aerotek, Inc. secured a default judgment against Cyberlux and its subsidiary Datron in North Carolina for over \$235,000, stemming from unpaid payroll obligations. Cyberlux didn't show up.

Then there's Thin Air Gear, a defense supplier who sued Cyberlux in Colorado federal court and also won by default in May 2025. Another case Cyberlux didn't contest.

RB Capital Partners filed in federal court in San Diego, seeking over \$5.6 million. That case has been reported as "settled," but as of this writing, no dismissal has been filed. Until it's off the docket, it counts.

And then we have ARG Group, which filed a complaint in North Carolina alleging breach of contract, unjust enrichment, conversion, and violations of unfair trade practices. The complaint alone reads like a primer in commercial abuse. The case is active.

So while Twitter keeps pretending there's "only one case," judges across three states are signing judgments Cyberlux never even showed up to contest.

The Taxman Rings Twice

While Cyberlux's recent filings try to project momentum, the U.S. Treasury tells another story.

In May 2024, the IRS filed a federal tax lien against Cyberlux Corporation in Durham County, North Carolina, totaling \$559,716.86. The lien includes multiple periods of unpaid 941 and 940 payroll taxes, some dating back as far as 2010.

This wasn't a clerical error or an isolated misunderstanding. The IRS does not move lightly. A lien like this means:

- The agency assessed the tax
- Demanded payment
- Received nothing
- Then formally secured its interest against all of Cyberlux's property and assets

As of now, the lien remains active.

That puts the IRS alongside Atlantic Wave, Aerotek, Legalist, and others as creditors—all jockeying for scraps from a company that's burning cash, defaulting in court, and reportedly renting locked facilities.

So while the press releases say growth, the government paperwork says insolvency.

Cyberlux's Strategy: Delay, Deflect, Default

If there's one through-line across Cyberlux's litigation history, it's not just nonpayment—it's nonparticipation.

Faced with enforcement in California? They removed it to federal court and got it dismissed. Served again? They removed a second time and lost again.

In Texas? They removed the case twice. Both times, the court sent it back. The second time, Judge Lee Rosenthal didn't just remand it. She ordered Cyberlux to pay Atlantic Wave's legal fees and described the removal attempt as "objectively unreasonable."

When sued by Aerotek? They didn't respond. When sued by Thin Air Gear? No answer. When sued by ARG Group? The case is active.

Even the two cases Cyberlux itself filed in Virginia? Abandoned.

This isn't a legal strategy. It's a pattern: delay until the money dries up or the creditors give up.

It's not that Cyberlux is winning. It's that they're trying not to play. Until they lose by default again.

A Pattern, Not a Phase

There's a narrative floating around that all of this happened before Cyberlux found its "mission," before the current vision, before things got serious.

But that narrative falls apart the moment you look at the calendar.

The default judgment in the Aerotek case? April 2025.

Thin Air Gear? May 2025.

Legalist's \$7.3 million claim? Still active.

The second California remand? March 2025.

Texas remand and fee order? May 2025.

ARG Group? Filed April 2025.

RB Capital? Filed August 2024.

IRS lien? May 2024.

And Atlantic Wave? Still active. Still winning. Across multiple states.

So no, this isn't some legacy liability from a past era. It's not a pre-mission.

This is happening now. And it's happening everywhere.

If anything, Cyberlux's litigation exposure has accelerated just like its press release cadence.

Because you can change your branding. But you can't rebrand a court docket.

Conclusion: When Lies Echo Loud Enough

This all started with a tweet—one that tried to reduce over a dozen court cases, federal liens, and default judgments to a footnote.

It's a familiar playbook: frame reality as FUD, minimize everything you can't explain, and call every critic a hater. Or worse, a paid basher.

But here's the difference:

Critics bring filings. Defenders bring vibes.

Cyberlux isn't under siege from pre-mission noise. It's under water in current litigation, active garnishments, and government liens. Its CEO is named in judgments. Its subsidiaries are losing cases. Its facilities are allegedly locked. And it's still issuing stock.

So the next time someone waves off these lawsuits as minor, ask one question:

How many courts have to disagree with Cyberlux before its defenders admit they were wrong?

Or maybe more simply:

How many judgments does it take before you stop calling it noise and start calling it what it is?

A pattern.

A crisis.

A ledger written in default.

Case #	Title	Jurisdiction	Nature	Status
1	Atlantic Wave v. Cyberlux & Schmidt	Richmond City Circuit Court (VA)	Breach of contract	Final judgment June 21, 2023
1A to 1J	Garnishment Actions (10 sub-cases)	Richmond City Circuit Court (VA)	Judgment enforcement	Mixed: active and dismissed
2	Atlantic Wave v. Cyberlux (CA 1st)	San Diego Superior, Úí Fed Ct	Judgment enforcement	Dismissed without prejudice
3	Atlantic Wave v. Cyberlux (CA 2nd)	San Diego Superior, Úí Fed Ct	Refiled enforcement	Remanded to state court
4	Atlantic Wave v. Cyberlux (TX)	Harris County Dist., Úí Fed Ct	Judgment domestication	Remanded twice; fees awarded to Atlantic Wave
5 & 6	Cyberlux v. Atlantic Wave (2 cases)	Richmond City Circuit Court (VA)	Contract/tort counterclaims	Filed, not prosecuted
7	Atlantic Wave v. Cyberlux (Share Dispute)	Richmond City Circuit Court (VA)	Breach of share agreement	Active
8	Thin Air Gear v. Cyberlux	U.S. District Court, CO	Breach of contract	Default judgment May 2025
9	Aerotek v. Cyberlux/Datron	Wake County Superior Court (NC)	Unpaid payroll	Default judgment April 11, 2025
10	ARG Group v. Cyberlux	Durham County Superior Court (NC)	Contract + fraud claims	Active
11	RB Capital v. Cyberlux	U.S. District Court, CA (3:24-cv-01434)	Finance dispute	Settlement pending
12	IRS Federal Tax Lien	Durham County, NC	Payroll tax delinquency	\$559K+ lien active May 2024

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 only—it's not legal advice, it's not financial guidance, and it'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, you're encouraged to verify independently because, let'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

Date Created

May 17, 2025

Author

jackson