



Why Texas Fraud Laws Matter in the Cyberlux Case: The Hidden Risk in the Receivership

Description

Court filings don't announce themselves with flashing lights and sirens. They don't scream *Something shady is happening here!* in big, bold letters. No, legal documents are far more subtle. If you want to know what's really going on in a case, you don't just read what's there—you read between the lines.

Take the Cyberlux receivership battle in Texas. On the surface, it looks like a standard case. A company owes money, refuses to pay, and now a court-appointed receiver is getting ready to take control of its assets. Business as usual, right? Except for one tiny detail buried in the plaintiffs' proposed order: a reference to Texas Fraudulent Transfer Act §24.009.

That's not a throwaway citation. You don't include fraudulent transfer statutes in a receivership unless you're trying to make a point. Normally, these cases run on Texas's Turnover Statute, which is all about collecting what a debtor currently owns. But fraudulent transfer laws? Those let a receiver look into what a debtor used to own—and more importantly, what they might have moved out of reach.

Which raises a question: why did the plaintiffs' attorneys feel the need to flag that?

Cyberlux is already dealing with more than one lawsuit. There's the receivership case from Atlantic Wave, a \$5+ million lawsuit from an investor, another suit from a supplier, and the looming possibility that both HII and Legalist could come knocking. And while all of that is unfolding, the court-appointed receiver is sitting on the sidelines, waiting for the judge to sign the written order so he can officially take control of whatever Cyberlux still has left. The verbal appointment has already happened. The next step is putting it in writing, and once that ink is dry, things could move very quickly.

And maybe that's the real reason §24.009 is sitting there in the proposed order like a quiet little time bomb. Normally, receivers focus on what's in front of them—assets that are readily available. But this little legal nugget suggests that the plaintiffs want to dig deeper. Not just into what Cyberlux has today, but into what it might have moved, reassigned, or conveniently placed in someone else's

hands.

Fraudulent transfer laws exist for exactly this kind of situation. If a debtor claims they can't pay, but money, contracts, or assets were recently sent elsewhere, creditors can ask why. Were these routine business transactions, or were they a way to move assets beyond reach? That's where Â§24.009 comes in—it allows plaintiffs to challenge those transfers and, in some cases, recover assets that should have been available for collection.

That could mean looking at past payments to executives, reassigned receivables, or large financial movements before legal troubles began. It could mean reviewing any transfers made while Cyberlux was already facing lawsuits or financial distress. The point isn't necessarily that something improper happened—it's that plaintiffs want the ability to look. And if Cyberlux's existing assets aren't enough to satisfy the debt, those past transfers become even more important.

The plaintiffs aren't saying outright that Cyberlux moved assets improperly. But they don't have to. Including Â§24.009 in the proposed order says it for them. It's a legal way of raising an eyebrow, a subtle but deliberate nudge to the court that maybe, just maybe, there's more to this story.

None of this means Cyberlux has been found guilty of fraudulent transfers. But courts don't just throw around fraudulent transfer laws for no reason. Someone thought this was worth flagging. Someone thinks the receiver might need to do more than just gather up whatever Cyberlux still has lying around. And given how many lawsuits are piling up, how much money has changed hands, and how much of Cyberlux's financial situation remains a mystery, it's hard to argue with them.

Because legal filings don't need to shout to tell you what's really happening. Sometimes, the quietest details say the most.

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. contracts
2. cyberlux
3. factoring
4. FMS

5. Ukraine

Date Created

February 10, 2025

Author

jackson