



Public Paycheque, Private Client: How One Lawyer Took Both Sides

Description

In recent years, Cyberlux Corporation has managed to stay in the headlines—but unfortunately, it’s not for groundbreaking inventions or record-breaking profits. Instead, they’ve become the star of an ongoing drama involving regulators, courts, and lawyers—a cocktail that rarely ends well.

Currently, Cyberlux seems caught in a corporate meltdown, resorting to dropping irrelevant press releases to distract everyone from their receivership drama in Texas. Nothing says “everything is fine” quite like releasing meaningless news while your financial foundation crumbles.

At the epicenter of this corporate soap opera is CEO Mark Schmidt and, intriguingly, Chuck Watts, who appears to wear the dual hats of in-house counsel and Greensboro City Attorney. Watts, bound by a seemingly exclusive full-time commitment to public service, somehow juggles private legal duties at Cyberlux. Even more eyebrow-raising, he reportedly pocketed approximately 50 million shares—worth roughly \$435,000—as part of a mysterious debt settlement. While the specifics of this debt remain murky, it’s reasonable to guess it might be for his ongoing legal services—after all, lawyers typically prefer payment over applause.

Watts didn’t just provide casual legal advice; he authored key opinions submitted to the OTC Exchange, opinions which perhaps contributed to Cyberlux earning the infamous “Caveat Emptor” badge—a polite Latin way of saying, “Buyer beware.” Unsurprisingly, the OTC wasn’t thrilled and swiftly added Watts to their “Prohibited Service Providers” list—a list you’d rather avoid being on.

Adding another layer to this tangled web, Jennifer Clark of Tjong & Hsia LLP continues to appear as Legal Counsel in Cyberlux’s OTC financial filings. Curiously, she’s nowhere to be found in other filings or actual legal proceedings, raising additional eyebrows about transparency—or rather, the lack of it.

Further complicating matters are the ethical and legal standards outlined in Greensboro’s own “Legal Handbook for Council Members 2022,” which explicitly emphasize conflicts of interest, ethical responsibilities, and stringent prohibitions against city officials receiving gifts or favors. Given

Watts's private involvement with Cyberlux and his substantial equity stake, these guidelines cast a glaring spotlight on potential conflicts and ethical breaches. As recently as May of 2025, Watts was actively filing court papers on behalf of Cyberlux in Durham County, North Carolina, making it clear his legal entanglement is not just historical but ongoing.

Emails reviewed by this outlet confirm that Watts listed 300 West Washington Street, City Hall as the official point of contact for legal work he was doing on behalf of Cyberlux. Even more damning? He used his official Greensboro city government email address to conduct that private business. This wasn't just a blurred line. It was a head-on collision between public office and private interest.

According to a source familiar with the matter, Watts told an individual in summer 2022 that if they sued Cyberlux, he'd bankrupt them—a threat so charming it might as well have come with a cigar and a villain monologue. It scared them enough to file suit that same week. Picture the legal equivalent of a knuckle crack across the table. While unconfirmed in court filings, it adds the kind of flair to Watts's counsel that would make even the most dramatic courtroom dramas seem tame.

In fact, by March 2025, legal correspondence reviewed by this outlet accused Watts of making knowingly false statements and pointedly reminded him of prior court sanctions, a 95% share price collapse, and his placement on the Prohibited Providers list—hardly a glowing review. The letter even referenced Watts's disbarment in stark terms and suggested a housecleaning was long overdue. If that's not a legal red flag wrapped in a cautionary email, it's hard to imagine what is.

Watts's use of his official government email address and City Hall as his law firm's mailing address could have broader implications beyond ethics. Legal experts say such behaviour may expose the City of Greensboro to claims of supervisory negligence—particularly if investors, regulators, or counterparties assumed his actions were officially sanctioned. If anyone relied on those communications believing Watts was speaking with city authority, it opens the door for potential liability. Not just for Watts, but for the very institution meant to keep such conflicts in check.

This isn't just bad optics. It's a civic breakdown. Public officials are entrusted to serve their communities—not moonlight for distressed defense contractors while using city hall as a return address. If that doesn't raise questions, nothing will.

Cyberlux doesn't need another press release. It needs an intervention. And Greensboro deserves answers.

Because when public duty starts cozying up with private disaster, it's not just a conflict—it's a collapse waiting to happen.

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

Tags

1. cyberlux

Date Created

June 24, 2025

Author

jackson