



Which genius thought calling a judge’s chambers with a veiled threat was a good idea?

Description

There’s anger on both sides of Cyberlux right now, and that part is entirely understandable. Money is on the line, reputations are being dragged through the mud, and the whole situation has turned into a noisy, public fight where nobody feels heard and everyone feels wronged.

What isn’t understandable is what happens when that anger stops being controlled.

Up until now, most of the behavior around Cyberlux, aggressive, personal, often ugly, was at least contained. It lived online. In comment threads, social media dogpiles, and the inboxes of journalists, critics, and shareholders. Not acceptable, but familiar. The internet, in all its predictable hostility.

Then someone decided that wasn’t enough.

Because in the Atlantic Wave v Cyberlux receivership case, the court itself records that an individual called directly into a judge’s chambers, demanded that the receivership be dissolved within hours, and followed it with what was described as a veiled threat when it wasn’t. That’s not interpretation. That’s in the filing.

Dear Counsel,

This Court through the district clerk's office received an ex parte phone call from a gentlemen identifying himself as Mr. Rittenhouse. Mr. Rittenhouse demanded that the receivership in your pending matter be dissolved by noon on Friday (today). He then issued a veiled threat that if the Court failed to do so, he would pay the Court a visit and I would never be a judge again. This communication was not initiated, encouraged or entertained by the Court. The caller hung up on the clerk. No other court staff member spoke with this caller.

I am notifying you because the canons require that when a court inadvertently receives an unauthorized ex parte communication, the judge shall make provisions to notify the parties of the substance of the communication and provide the parties with an opportunity to respond.

A copy of this e-mail is being placed in the case file.

Sincerely,

Judge Michael Gomez

129th District Court

FILED

Marilyn Burgess
District Clerk

MAR 20 2026

Time: _____

Harris County, Texas

By _____

Deputy

At this point, you have to pause and ask what kind of thinking leads someone to believe that pressuring a judge like this is remotely sensible. Courts are not call centers. Judges do not respond to urgency, volume, or entitlement. That is quite literally the point of having a court.

And yet, here we are.

This is the line, and it has now been crossed. What was once contained hostility directed at individuals has spilled into an attempt to pressure the legal system itself.

That should concern everyone.

Because anger isn't the issue. Anger is expected. Sometimes it's even justified. The issue is self-control.

Adults have it. They argue their case, gather evidence, and let the process play out.

What we're seeing, repeatedly, from parts of the Cyberlux-aligned ecosystem is the opposite. Not just anger, but escalation. Critics are targeted. Narratives are enforced. Pressure increases when it doesn't get the desired result.

And now that pressure has reached a courtroom.

Here's the part that seems to be misunderstood.

When people are operating from ethics and evidence, pressure doesn't make them back down. It doesn't silence them. It doesn't change their position.

It hardens it.

They document more carefully. They speak more clearly. And they stay exactly where they are.

So if the idea here was that intimidation, online or otherwise, would force a different outcome, it hasn't just failed.

It's exposed the problem.

Because once you reach the point where someone thinks calling a judge with a threat is a good idea, you're no longer defending a position.

You've lost control.

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 23, 2026

Author

jackson