Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Confidential Information Memorandum (CIM): How to Read One

> Build a more reviewable acquisition pipeline with Docket. Our deal-origination software and managed research help private equity teams screen companies against a mandate and understand the evidence behind each finding.

Published by Docket · 2026-10-29 · confidential information memorandum · cim in m&a · cim memorandum · cim mergers and acquisitions

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/confidential-information-memorandum-how-to-read



In this article

1. What a CIM is and where it sits in a sale process
2. Anatomy of a CIM
3. How to read a CIM section by section
4. What a CIM selects and what it omits
5. Red-flag claims and a fictional worked example
6. The legal backdrop: reliance and non-reliance
7. The other CIM: financing memoranda
8. Reading checklist
9. Sources

What a CIM is and where it sits in a sale process

A confidential information memorandum (CIM) is the seller's written presentation of a business to prospective buyers, usually prepared by the seller's adviser with management and released only after a confidentiality agreement is signed (see the CIM definition). It is usually the first detailed document a buyer receives, and first-round bids are commonly priced from it. This article treats it as what it is: a set of claims written by the party that wants the highest price, to be read section by section and tested against records the seller did not write.

The usual sequence

Training material for private equity (PE) analysts describes a standard order: the banker sends an anonymous teaser, the buyer signs a non-disclosure agreement (NDA), the banker sends the CIM, the buyer speaks with management and builds a model, and the buyer then submits an expression of interest or non-binding offer, followed by data room access, an in-person management meeting and a letter of intent (LOI) (Corporate Finance Institute). That page is a teaching summary, not a rule; real processes reorder the steps.

What two public merger proxies show

The best public evidence of how CIMs are actually used is the "Background of the Merger" section of a definitive merger proxy statement (Form DEFM14A), where a public target narrates its own sale process. Two recent examples follow. Both are sales of public companies, run by large investment banks, and they are larger and more formal than a typical lower-middle-market process. They show the role of the CIM, not the scale an independent sponsor should expect.

Step	Whole Earth Brands (sold to affiliates of Sababa Holdings FREE LLC)	Hillenbrand (sold to Lone Star)
Outreach	Over the whole process, Jefferies "had contacted more than sixty parties"	Evercore contacted 21 parties besides Lone Star; 18 of the 22 were financial sponsors
NDA	Eleven parties, including Sababa, signed NDAs	16 confidentiality agreements, each with "customary standstill provisions"

Step	Whole Earth Brands (sold to affiliates of Sababa Holdings FREE LLC)	Hillenbrand (sold to Lone Star)
CIM	Distribution began September 19, 2023, "including the September Projections"	Prepared in July 2025; "included management's financial forecasts through 2030"
Process letter	October 9, 2023, to seven parties other than Sababa, requesting indications of interest by October 23	From July 24, 2025, to all 16, with a copy of the CIM, proposals due August 13
Management meetings	Not described at this stage	Presentations to 12 potential buyers in late July and early August, before proposals
First-round result	No indication of interest from any party other than Sababa	Four written proposals from $23 to $34 per share, plus one oral indication

Sources: Whole Earth Brands DEFM14A, Background of the Merger (filed 2024-06-24); Hillenbrand DEFM14A, Background of the Merger (filed 2025-12-01).

Three points follow from these passages. First, the CIM goes only to parties under an NDA; in the Whole Earth process, the eleven NDA signers "received copies of a confidential information memorandum", and six of them accessed the virtual data room. Second, management presentations can come before first-round bids, as in Hillenbrand, rather than after them. Third, a first-round indication of interest priced off the CIM is provisional. Lone Star proposed $34 per share in August 2025; its September 29 proposal was $31, and the proxy records that the "decrease in price from Lone Star's August 13 bid was due to additional information received during due diligence." The signed price was $32.00. A buyer who prices only the CIM is pricing before diligence.

Anatomy of a CIM

There is no mandated format. The same training page lists what a CIM typically contains: "the investment thesis for the company," "an overview of the market and the company, products and service offerings, a revenue profile," and an "employee profile, and financials (historical, projections, and capital structure)" (Corporate Finance Institute). Lower-middle-market CIMs often add a short history of the owner and a section on the reasons for the sale. Treat any list, including the one below, as typical rather than fixed.

How to read a CIM section by section

Each section makes a different kind of claim, and each kind is tested differently. Some can be checked against public records before the first call with management; most financial claims can only be tested in the data room or a quality of earnings review. The table separates the two.

CIM section	What it claims	What to verify	Independent record that can test it
Investment highlights	Why the business is attractive	Whether each highlight is backed by a figure elsewhere in the CIM	The CIM itself: cross-reference every highlight to a page
History and ownership	Founding date, legal entities, ownership changes	Which legal entity is being sold; prior names; affiliates	State business-entity registry filings for each named entity

CIM section	What it claims	What to verify	Independent record that can test it
Facilities and operations	Sites, capacity, certifications	That the sites exist and are operated by the entity being sold	OSHA establishment search for inspections; EPA ECHO for environmental compliance and enforcement
Products and services	What is sold, to whom, at what mix	Whether the description matches what the company told the public over time	The company's own website and archived copies of it in the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine; trade-licence or certification registries
Customers and revenue profile	Concentration, retention, contract terms	Revenue from the largest single customer, not just "top ten"	Customer-level revenue file and contracts in the data room; public contract award data where the buyer is a government
Market and competition	Market size, growth, share	The source, date and definition behind every market number	The cited report itself; if no source is given, treat the figure as the seller's estimate
Management and employees	Team, tenure, headcount	Who stays after closing; key-person dependence	Interviews; LinkedIn and registry officer listings for tenure claims
Historical financials	Revenue, margins, EBITDA by year	Whether figures are audited, reviewed or compiled; period ends	Financial statements and tax returns in the data room; quality of earnings work
Adjustments	Bridge from reported to adjusted EBITDA	Evidence and recurrence of each add-back	General ledger detail and invoices behind each adjustment
Projections	Future revenue and margins	Assumptions, the base year, and the final-year margin	Backlog, pipeline and pricing evidence; the historical range of the same margins
Capital structure	Debt, leases, liens	Liens and secured lenders not mentioned in the text	UCC financing statements at the relevant secretary of state; PACER for federal litigation and bankruptcy filings

Public records test existence, identity, liens, inspections and litigation. They do not test revenue, margins or customer economics. Record which claims a public record could test and which remain open until diligence, so the open ones do not drift into the model as facts. An evidence packet is one way to keep that distinction on paper.

What a CIM selects and what it omits

A CIM is a marketing document, and the purchase agreement usually says so. Hillenbrand's merger agreement, attached to its proxy, provides that any "teaser, marketing material, confidential information memorandum, management presentations" and similar materials "are not and shall not be deemed to be or include representations or warranties unless and to the extent expressly set forth in a representation or warranty" in the agreement (Hillenbrand DEFM14A, Annex A). A buyer's contractual protection lives in the representations it negotiates, not in the CIM.

Projections deserve the most scepticism, because they are the seller's assumptions rather than observations. The Hillenbrand proxy shows how much a single assumption matters. The CIM forecasts ran through 2030 and "did not include any terminal year financial metrics." Late in the process the board considered whether a fairness analysis could rest on the "21.1% terminal year adjusted EBITDA margin that was reflected in the Financial Projections for fiscal year 2030"; Evercore said it anticipated it could not render a fairness opinion on that basis, and the board directed that the forecasts include "a mid-cycle adjusted EBITDA margin of 18.5%" for the terminal year, citing the business's cyclicality (Hillenbrand DEFM14A). Bidders had already flagged the issue: their first-round feedback included "risk to management's projection of adjusted EBITDA for fiscal year 2026." The lesson for a smaller deal is narrow: compare a CIM's final-year margin with the company's own historical range before it reaches a terminal value.

Omissions matter as much as claims. A CIM rarely volunteers pending litigation, lapsed licences, a lender's lien or a customer that has given notice. These are the items public records are best at finding.

Red-flag claims and a fictional worked example

Common red flags, each of which calls for a document request rather than a conclusion:

- A market-share figure with no named source, date or market definition.
- Customer concentration described only as "top ten customers", which can hide one dominant account.
- Pro forma revenue from contracts signed recently or not yet signed.
- Add-backs for "one-time" costs that recur in several years.
- Cost savings that depend on actions the buyer, not the seller, will take.
- A projection whose final-year margin is above every historical year.

Fictional example: Harrow Valley Fabrication

Fictional. Harrow Valley Fabrication is an invented contract metal fabricator with two plants. Its CIM presents fiscal-year 2025 adjusted EBITDA of $5.00 million against reported EBITDA of $3.10 million. A reader classifies each add-back by the evidence it would need.

Item (fictional)	CIM amount ($m)	Reader's classification	Reader's provisional amount ($m)
Reported EBITDA	3.10	Starting point; tie to financial statements	3.10
Owner salary above a market replacement	0.45	Supportable if payroll records and a replacement salary estimate agree	0.30
Legal settlement	0.30	One-time only if no similar cost in prior years; the CIM's own three-year bridge also adds back legal settlements in 2023 and 2024	0.00
Plant 2 relocation costs	0.15	Plausibly one-time; request invoices	0.15
Run-rate of a contract signed in month 11	0.60	Pro forma; one month of history	0.00

Item (fictional)	CIM amount ($m)	Reader's classification	Reader's provisional amount ($m)
Planned headcount reduction	0.40	Forward-looking; depends on post-closing action	0.00
Adjusted EBITDA	5.00		3.55

The gap is $1.45 million, or 29% of the CIM figure. If a buyer applied the same illustrative 6.0x multiple to both numbers, the difference in enterprise value would be $8.7 million. The multiple is arbitrary and used only to show scale; it is not a market estimate.

Two public-record checks in the same fictional case change the questions for the first management call. A UCC financing statement names an equipment lender that does not appear in the CIM's capital structure section. An OSHA inspection record exists for Plant 2 under a predecessor entity name. Neither is disqualifying. Both are now specific requests.

The legal backdrop: reliance and non-reliance

The non-reliance clause above has a legal consequence that buyers should understand before treating a CIM as anything more than a lead. The standard Delaware reference is *ABRY Partners V, L.P. v. F&W Acquisition LLC*, decided by the Court of Chancery on February 14, 2006 (opinion, PDF via Justia). The case did not concern a CIM. A private equity buyer sought to rescind a stock purchase agreement whose remedy for misrepresentation was capped at a $20 million indemnity fund, 4% of the $500 million price. The buyer, in the court's words, "accepted that it had promised that the only representations of fact it was relying upon and the only representations of fact made to it were contained within the Agreement itself," and built its claim only on the contract's own representations.

On those facts the court held that the public policy of Delaware "will not permit the Seller to insulate itself from the possibility that the sale would be rescinded if the Buyer can show either: 1) that the Seller knew that the Company's contractual representations and warranties were false; or 2) that the Seller itself lied to the Buyer about a contractual representation and warranty." It also held that sophisticated parties may allocate the risk of factual errors that were not intentionally made.

The opinion notes that "the case law of this court gives effect to nonreliance provisions that disclaim reliance on extra-contractual representations." The practical reading is narrow. Under a clear non-reliance clause, a buyer should assume that a statement which appears only in the CIM will not support a claim, and that any fact it is relying on must become a representation in the agreement. This is a description of one opinion, not legal advice; the drafting is for deal counsel.

The other CIM: financing memoranda

The same term is used for a different document on the debt side of a buyout. Heidrick & Struggles' merger agreement requires the company, at the buyer's reasonable request, to cooperate "in the preparation of any customary confidential information memorandum or similar customary marketing documents" for the buyer's

debt financing, and allows the buyer to share company information with prospective lenders subject to "confidentiality provisions contained in customary confidential information memorandum" (Heidrick & Struggles DEFM14A, merger agreement Section 5.17, filed 2025-11-03). A lender CIM markets a loan to prospective lenders; a sell-side CIM markets a company to buyers. Search results mix the two, so confirm which one a document is.

Reading checklist

Fifteen questions to answer before submitting an indication of interest. The answers in brackets are for the fictional Harrow Valley case.

1. Which legal entity is being sold, and does it match the registry? [Yes; one predecessor name found.]
2. Who prepared the CIM, and as of what date? [Seller's adviser; financials through fiscal-year end.]
3. Are the historical financials audited, reviewed or compiled? [Reviewed.]
4. Does reported EBITDA tie to the financial statements? [To be confirmed in data room.]
5. Is each add-back documented and non-recurring? [No: three of five are excluded and one is reduced pending payroll evidence.]
6. Does any revenue rely on pro forma contracts? [Yes, $0.60 million.]
7. What share of revenue comes from the single largest customer? [Not disclosed; requested.]
8. Does every market figure have a named source and date? [No.]
9. What is the projection's final-year margin compared with history? [Above every historical year.]
10. Do liens on file match the stated capital structure? [No; one unlisted lender.]
11. Are there inspections, enforcement actions or lawsuits on record? [One OSHA inspection.]
12. Do the company's past public descriptions match the CIM? [Consistent.]
13. Which managers stay after closing? [Not addressed.]
14. Which claims can only be tested in diligence? [Customer economics, add-back support.]
15. Which claims would need to become representations in the purchase agreement? [Customer notices, liens, litigation.]

Docket's Scout agent records answers of this kind as typed values, each quoting a retained page verbatim, and its Audit agent strikes anything unquotable and leaves the gaps open.

Sources

1. Private Equity Transaction Timeline — Corporate Finance Institute, published 2019-10-24; teaching sequence of teaser, NDA, CIM, expression of interest, LOI, and typical CIM contents. Accessed 2026-10-28.
2. Whole Earth Brands, Inc., Definitive Proxy Statement (DEFM14A) — U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission EDGAR, filed 2024-06-24; Background of the Merger: outreach, NDAs, CIM distribution, process letter, indications of interest. Accessed 2026-10-28.
3. Hillenbrand, Inc., Definitive Proxy Statement (DEFM14A) — U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission EDGAR, filed 2025-12-01; Background of the Merger (CIM with forecasts through 2030, management presentations, proposals, price changes, terminal margin) and merger agreement non-reliance

language. Accessed 2026-10-28.
4. Heidrick & Struggles International, Inc., Definitive Proxy Statement (DEFM14A) — U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission EDGAR, filed 2025-11-03; merger agreement Section 5.17 on debt-financing confidential information memoranda. Accessed 2026-10-28.
5. OSHA Establishment Search — U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration; search of enforcement inspections by establishment name. Accessed 2026-10-28.
6. ECHO: Enforcement and Compliance History Online — U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; facility environmental compliance and enforcement search. Accessed 2026-10-28.
7. PACER: Public Access to Court Electronic Records — Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; electronic public access to federal court records. Accessed 2026-10-28.
8. ABRY Partners V, L.P. v. F&W Acquisition LLC, C.A. No. 1756-N, 891 A.2d 1032 — Delaware Court of Chancery (Strine, V.C.), decided 2006-02-14, opinion PDF via Justia; public-policy limit on contractual insulation from a seller's knowing misrepresentation within the contract, and enforcement of non-reliance provisions. Accessed 2026-10-28.
9. Wayback Machine — Internet Archive; archived copies of web pages by URL and date. Accessed 2026-10-28.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/valuation/private-equity-transaction-timeline
2. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1753706/000114036124031141/ny20024121x13_defm14a.htm
3. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1417398/000114036125043734/ny20057804x2_defm14a.htm
4. https://www.osha.gov/ords/imis/establishment.html
5. https://echo.epa.gov
6. https://web.archive.org
7. https://pacer.uscourts.gov
8. https://cases.justia.com/delaware/court-of-chancery/72140-0.pdf?ts=1462311424
9. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1066605/000119312525261675/d176641ddefm14a.htm

THE PUBLISHER

About Docket

Docket provides deal-origination research software and managed research for private equity firms. We help investment teams investigate acquisition targets using structured screening criteria, retained sources and reviewable company evidence. Teams can work through a self-serve platform or use managed research, depending on how they want research delivered.

Research against a defined mandate

A useful target list needs more than company names. Docket focuses on the questions that determine whether a company fits an investment mandate, including the evidence needed to support or qualify each answer. Our research approach makes the connection between screening criteria, source material and conclusions visible to the team reviewing the work.

Triage, Scout and Audit

Docket's three named research agents perform complementary tasks. Triage resolves company identity and screens fit. Scout collects sourced answers against the mandate. Audit checks retained evidence, addresses contradictions and leaves unsupported answers visibly unresolved. This structure helps reviewers distinguish established findings from missing information and questions requiring further investigation.

Evidence that supports investment-team judgment

Our research library covers market mapping, screening criteria, private-company data, succession and ownership, source evaluation and evidence standards. These resources explain the methods and limitations behind origination research. Findings support a team's judgment; they do not establish that a company is for sale or guarantee a transaction or investment outcome.

Work with Docket

Visit Docket to explore the platform, managed research and the current contact path. Read about screening criteria, evidence standards, AI research agents and market mapping.

Public examples are illustrative unless explicitly identified otherwise. Research preparation and authorized outreach are separate activities; confidential target lists and customer outcomes should never be inferred from an educational example.

Website: https://docket.capital

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.