



## Threats vs. Truth: Cyberlux's Bold Move Against Investigative Reporting

### Description

When we started investigating Cyberlux Corporation, asking exactly where millions of taxpayer-funded defense dollars were disappearing, we anticipated resistance—but **threats** of espionage charges from company executives and online trolls plastering my family's information across the internet felt less like corporate damage control and more like the opening scene of a bad spy thriller. **Indeed, one chilling message from a Cyberlux executive suggested stalking and personal surveillance of my family members, amplifying the sense of genuine threat we faced.**

Our investigation had already uncovered a pattern of disturbing financial manoeuvres. In the last 30 days alone, we detailed nearly \$7 million in questionable payments. Funds were funneled to a shadowy [UK shell company](#) so freshly minted it barely had time to acquire a virtual office—no employees, no products, and sharing a mailing address with hundreds of other ghost firms. It was akin to handing your car keys to a total stranger and expecting it to return freshly painted.

Then came the shocking revelation: [\\$2.5 million sent to Rosewood Theater LLC](#), known far more for lap dances than logistics. Even more audacious was their open admission that this substantial sum was explicitly intended as [compensation for securing a defense contract](#). Subtlety wasn't part of their strategy—it was more like doing donuts in a Ferrari outside a police station.

Not to be overshadowed, [Montague Capital Partners](#) publicly demanded a \$3.5 million commission, proudly tying their claim directly to the taxpayer-funded defense deal. Their audacity reached new heights when they doubled down, filing yet another claim on Friday the 13th—apparently not deterred by the scrutiny. Moreover, Cyberlux's financial turmoil took another twist: initially entering receivership on May 22nd, briefly escaping receivership on June 12th, only to plunge back into it the same day ([read the SECOND receivership court order here](#)). This chaotic sequence has given rise to confusion and denial, with some still insisting the company isn't truly under receivership despite clear court orders.

[Montague's Second Filing for InterventionDownload](#)

Each revelation, carefully verified through public disclosures, legal documents, and court records, built upon the last, creating a narrative of escalating absurdity and danger. But the clearer we made the situation, the harsher the backlash became. Executives delivered threats straight out of a Bond villain's script—accusations of espionage and dire warnings delivered through intermediaries. Online trolls simultaneously launched coordinated attacks, exposing personal details and targeting family members, banking on intimidation to silence our investigative efforts.

While harassment in response to investigative journalism isn't unprecedented, this coordinated assault—combining legal threats, accusations of espionage, and online harassment—was both rare and alarming, even for journalists accustomed to pushback. Such extreme measures, though meant to silence questions, only confirmed their urgency.

Now, with Cyberlux still in receivership, the stakes have escalated further. The court-appointed receiver isn't just tasked with cataloging debts but is meticulously examining the validity—and legality—of every claimed obligation. Claims like Montague's, already dubious on their face, should now be under intense scrutiny.

Ultimately, this isn't merely about financial impropriety; it's about safeguarding national security, public trust, and taxpayer accountability. When a defense initiative becomes a pipeline for dubious payouts and backroom deals, it undermines the very security it's meant to uphold.

This is precisely why investigative journalism exists. Each threat, each attempt at intimidation, reaffirms the importance of asking tough questions and demanding transparency. The louder the **threats**, the clearer our mission became.

To Cyberlux—and to anyone who mistakes intimidation for a valid response—our message is clear: we're not backing down.

## 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
2. Featured

## Date Created

June 14, 2025

## Author

jackson