Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

How to Verify Debtor Identity in PACER: Triage Worksheet

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 · 2026-10-27 · how to verify debtor identity in pacer · pacer bankruptcy search · debtor identity verification · bankruptcy debtor checklist · legal entity matching · bankruptcy case status · private equity origination · acquisition target research · pacer case locator

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/pacer-bankruptcy-debtor-identity-triage-worksheet



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Define the Target Before Searching
4. Choose the Search Route and Preserve Coverage
5. Match the Debtor to the Resolved Entity
6. Read Case Stage Before Writing the Claim
7. Build the Debtor-Match Worksheet and Handoff
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Case Studies and Real-World Examples
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
12. Conclusion

Executive Summary

To **verify debtor identity in PACER**, begin with the acquisition candidate's resolved legal entity, locate possible cases, confirm the party is the debtor, and reconcile the petition's identifiers with independent corporate records. A name match is a lead for investigation. It is not a sufficient finding that the acquisition target filed, is insolvent, or is available for purchase. Public Access to Court Electronic Records (**PACER**) distinguishes nationwide discovery through the **PACER Case Locator** from detailed records in the filing court's Case Management/Electronic Case Files (**CM/ECF**) system. The national index updates every **24 hours**, typically nightly; specific-court records update as new records are filed. (pacer.uscourts.gov)

The recommended deliverable has separate decisions for **identity**, **case event**, and **legal consequence**. Resolve the target's legal name, formation jurisdiction, registry number, prior names, and relationship to any parent before accepting a hit. Corporate registration in another state can represent foreign qualification rather than a different company. A registered-agent address can differ from the principal business address. (www.sba.gov) (www.sos.state.tx.us) For a voluntary non-individual filing, **Official Form 201** supplies debtor-identification fields; it requests other names used during the previous **eight years**. Compare the actual filed document, including amendments, with the target evidence rather than treating a search-result label as the complete record. (www.uscourts.gov)

Keep case stage separate from identity. A filing, conversion, dismissal, discharge, confirmation, sale authorization, and closure support different statements. Closure alone does not establish discharge, while a confirmed plan still has an implementation stage. (www.cacb.uscourts.gov) (www.justice.gov) Likewise, a sale motion is a request for authority, and the rules separately contemplate reporting after completion. Joint administration can bring affiliated cases together procedurally without making the debtors interchangeable. (www.law.cornell.edu) (www.ctb.uscourts.gov)

As of **October 2026**, PACER's published access charge is **$0.10 per page**; the current cap for eligible case documents is **$3**, while name-search reports have no maximum fee. (pacer.uscourts.gov) This report provides a field checklist, a stage-to-claim matrix, a copyable debtor-match worksheet, and fictional accepted, rejected, and unresolved outcomes. Its acceptance standard is deliberately narrow: establish which entity the record concerns, state the dated event the evidence supports, preserve gaps, and refer questions about rights, assets, and transaction structure to bankruptcy counsel.

Introduction and Background

A bankruptcy hit can interrupt a private equity (**PE**) screen before a researcher has established what the hit actually represents. The operating brand may differ from the legal entity. A person connected with the business may be named separately. A holding company or affiliate may appear in related proceedings. New York's corporate guidance describes a corporation as legally separate from the individuals composing it, while the federal bankruptcy rules expressly contemplate related cases involving a debtor and an affiliate. Those distinctions matter when attaching a case to a target record. (dos.ny.gov) (www.law.cornell.edu)

The screening question should therefore be written before searching: **Does this record concern the resolved target entity, and what dated case fact can be supported?** It should not begin with a conclusion about financial condition or acquisition availability. This report proposes a research protocol for that bounded question. It is intended for Docket's PE origination readership and treats the output as a reviewable research handoff. The publisher's role is target research; interpretation of a particular case's legal consequences belongs with counsel.

An official bankruptcy court FAQ describes moving from a national debtor search to the case's docket. That transition is essential: the search locates a candidate record, while the court material permits a closer examination of the named debtor. A general name hit still needs role and identity checks before it can be attached to the acquisition target. (www.canb.uscourts.gov)

The protocol below separates search coverage from identity confidence and case-stage evidence. It uses official registries for company identity, the petition for debtor identification, and the docket and underlying documents for events. It offers no prevalence estimate, probability of insolvency, or financial-risk score from name-search hits. Those calculations would require a defined population, resolved entities, and outcome evidence that this screening workflow does not supply.

Define the Target Before Searching

Separate identity, event, and consequence

Use **identity** for the relationship between the target record and the named debtor. Use **event** for a dated procedural occurrence supported by a record. Use **consequence** for the effect on debts, ownership, assets, contractual rights, or a proposed transaction. These are proposed research categories, not statutory classifications.

They prevent a true statement about one field from becoming an unsupported statement about another. For example, the Internal Revenue Service (**IRS**) distinguishes dismissal from discharge: dismissal ends bankruptcy protection without relieving debts, while discharge is a court order addressing certain debts. Neither description substitutes for resolving which entity is involved. (www.irs.gov)

Build a target identity record

Start with a jurisdiction-qualified registry identifier rather than a cleaned company name alone. California defines jurisdiction by the laws under which the entity was organized. The Small Business Administration explains that a company may form in one state and foreign-qualify elsewhere. Consequently, formation state, registration state, operating location, and filing court should occupy separate fields. (www.sos.ca.gov) (www.sba.gov)

The proposed minimum target record is:

- **Legal name:** preserve the registry spelling and legal suffix.
- **Formation jurisdiction:** identify the authority maintaining the formation record.
- **Registry number:** retain the number together with its issuing jurisdiction.
- **Name history:** link prior legal names and assumed names to dated documents.
- **Addresses:** distinguish principal business, mailing, and registered-office fields.
- **Group relationship:** record the evidence for a parent, subsidiary, or sister entity.
- **Reference date:** state when each identifier was collected and which period it describes.
- **Target scope:** specify whether the mandate concerns an operating entity, holding company, or assets.
- **Identifier provenance:** record who supplied each identifier and the underlying document.
- **Open conflicts:** retain inconsistent names, dates, and relationships for resolution.
- **Review owner:** identify who can accept a match and who handles legal questions.

Registry search capabilities vary. Washington supports business-name and **Unified Business Identifier (UBI)** searches. Massachusetts identifies entity-name, identification-number, and filing-number search routes. Texas's entity instructions use the legal name and Secretary of State file number. These support retrieving the precise registry record rather than selecting the first plausible name. (www.sos.wa.gov) (www.mass.gov) (www.sos.state.tx.us)

Aliases need their own evidence. New York describes assumed-name filing for specified entity types using a name other than the true legal name. Florida's fictitious-name search connects registrations with the owning entity's charter or document number, and multiple registrations may share that owner identifier. Treat that relationship as a documented bridge, not permission to merge every similarly branded company. (dos.ny.gov) (dos.fl.gov)

Preserve same-name candidates in separate rows until resolved. New Jersey warns that spacing and punctuation affect its search results. Query variants are therefore worth logging, but a broader query should expand the candidate list rather than relax the acceptance standard. (www.nj.gov)

Choose the Search Route and Preserve Coverage

Nationwide discovery versus the court record

Use the **national locator** when the filing court is unknown. Use the **specific court** when the court and case number are known, particularly for checking recent activity. The national index is updated nightly, whereas the court route updates as records are filed. Record which route supplied each finding instead of presenting both as equally current. (pacer.uscourts.gov)

The locator supports advanced features such as region and date range. Search planning should reflect known facts without excluding plausible matches too early: begin with documented legal names, then test documented former names and distinctive variants. Record rejected candidates rather than deleting them from the search history. (pacer.uscourts.gov)

For a PACER bankruptcy search by business name, the official manual describes entering the company name in **Last Name**, selecting a party role, and using only one search criterion in the described court query. (pacer.uscourts.gov) Preserve the screen and settings used. Do not assume every field entered was combined as a logical filter, or apply that court-interface warning to every national-index feature.

Log the search, including unsuccessful work

For each query, retain:

- **Search term:** exact text, including suffixes, spacing, and punctuation.
- **Search route:** national locator or named court interface.
- **Scope:** court type, role, region, date filters, and other selections.
- **Retrieval time:** date, time, and time zone of the search.
- **Candidate set:** possible matches and reasons for rejecting individual rows.
- **Access result:** records reviewed, unavailable documents, and outstanding work.
- **Cost record:** charge observed, saved result, and any spending limit.

PACER's guidance lists party names, case numbers, and tax identifiers among bankruptcy search keys. An available search field does not mean the researcher possesses reliable or authorized input. Prefer documented business identifiers; do not seek personal Social Security numbers for this company-screening task. (pacer.uscourts.gov)

Distinguish web searches from application programming interface (**API**) behavior. PACER's announcement about its bankruptcy identifier search distinguishes the web verification process from the API's requirement to supply a last or business name. A remembered workflow from another interface is insufficient evidence that a search was complete. (pacer.uscourts.gov)

A no-result record should state **no matching case found within the documented searches**, with its scope and timestamp. The national index's update cycle limits immediate negative findings, and older records can have different document-access conditions. The Northern District of California explains that docket information may remain online while access to other documents from older cases is restricted. Preserve that limitation rather than converting unavailable documents into evidence of absence. (www.canb.uscourts.gov)

Match the Debtor to the Resolved Entity

Compare fields with different evidentiary weights

For a voluntary non-individual case, inspect the actual **Official Form 201** petition when authorized access is available. It identifies the debtor and includes an Employer Identification Number (**EIN**), business and mailing addresses, principal-assets location, and website. Its address fields distinguish different address purposes, so compare like with like. (www.uscourts.gov)

Table 1 below sets out the proposed field-level identity checklist. The acceptance rules are research recommendations, not a court-defined scoring system.

Field	Comparison to make	Interpretation and limit
Party role	Confirm debtor status in the case, not merely a matching participant name.	The court search described in the manual permits role selection. (pacer.uscourts.gov)
Name and history	Compare petition name with registry legal name and documented aliases.	The voluntary petition requests other names over eight years. (www.uscourts.gov)
Formation and registration	Preserve formation jurisdiction separately from foreign registrations.	California cautions that foreign-entity status concerns the California registration. (www.sos.ca.gov)
Registry identifier	Match the identifier within the issuing registry.	Washington supports a UBI search; record the authority as well as the value. (www.sos.wa.gov)
Business address	Compare equivalent address types and dates.	Texas says a registered office need not be the principal business location. (www.sos.state.tx.us)
EIN, if legitimately available	Compare verified business identifiers without publishing them unnecessarily.	The IRS restricts telephone disclosure of a missing EIN to authorized recipients. (www.irs.gov)
Court and case number	Retain both as the case reference.	A national result leads to the specific court docket for more detail. (www.canb.uscourts.gov)
Affiliate relationship	Keep the target and related debtor as separate entities with a documented link.	Joint administration is procedural under the cited Connecticut rule. (www.ctb.uscourts.gov)

The table favors explanations over field-counting. An address difference may require historical records. Several weak similarities cannot override a verified contradictory identifier; explain the conflict rather than hiding it inside a score.

Resolve contradictions without forcing a match

An EIN needs provenance. The IRS says a business-name, address, or responsible-party change does not itself require a new EIN, so an unchanged number does not establish that other fields are current. (www.irs.gov) Missing authorized access leaves an unanswered field. (www.irs.gov)

The Securities and Exchange Commission (**SEC**) assigns a **Central Index Key (CIK)** to an entity or individual filer, not every private company. (www.sec.gov) For an available **Legal Entity Identifier (LEI)** record, the Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation (**GLEIF**) describes the registration-authority and local EntityID cross-reference. (www.gleif.org) A register reference can lack an EntityID; preserve the gap. (www.gleif.org)

Do not reject a candidate solely because its filing district differs from its formation state. The cited statutory venue text permits several bases, including principal business location or principal assets; it also addresses an affiliate's pending case. The district is a useful search fact, not a direct incorporation-state identifier. (www.govinfo.gov)

Use **accepted match**, **rejected match**, or **unresolved hit** for identity. Acceptance requires a documented chain between debtor and target with material contradictions resolved. Rejection identifies a different entity. Unresolved means the evidence cannot distinguish candidates.

Read Case Stage Before Writing the Claim

Separate the index from the underlying document

The index is a discovery source. An event-sensitive statement needs the docket entry and, where necessary, its underlying petition, order, plan, or completion document. A petition may be voluntary or involuntary; the official bankruptcy guidance describes an involuntary petition as filed by creditors. Preserve that distinction in the event description instead of saying the company voluntarily filed when the evidence does not show it. (www.uscourts.gov)

A **Chapter 11** label is also insufficient to describe the operating outcome. The official explanation says the debtor may continue operating and that a liquidating plan is permissible. The screening note should identify the chapter and dated stage without translating them into a business-survival conclusion. (www.uscourts.gov)

Table 2 below provides the proposed stage-to-claim matrix. Each suggested statement still depends on resolving the debtor's identity.

Observed stage	Evidence to retain	Narrow claim and escalation boundary
Indexed case	Locator result with court, number, filed and closed fields	A case is indexed under the recorded party name. The index alone does not resolve target identity. (pacer.uscourts.gov)
Petition	Actual filed petition and amendments	State the petition type and filing fact. Voluntary and involuntary petitions differ. (www.uscourts.gov)
Apparent pending case	Current docket review and retrieval timestamp	Say what the reviewed docket showed; leave activity after retrieval unknown.
Conversion	docket entry and conversion order	State the documented chapter change rather than relying on the original chapter. (www.cacb.uscourts.gov)
Dismissal	Dismissal entry and order	Report dismissal; do not call it discharge. The IRS distinguishes the effects. (www.irs.gov)
Plan confirmation	Confirmation order and identified plan	Report confirmation separately from implementation or consummation. (www.justice.gov)
Sale request or authorization	Motion, authorizing order, and relevant terms	Identify the procedural step. A motion requesting authority does not establish completion. (www.law.cornell.edu)
Completed sale	Completion evidence tied to the assets and parties	Verify completion separately; the rule contemplates an itemized statement after sale. (www.law.cornell.edu)
Closure or reopening	Closing entry or decree, later docket, reopening order if present	Closure does not itself establish discharge; the Code permits reopening. (www.cacb.uscourts.gov) (www.govinfo.gov)

The matrix keeps language tied to evidence. An analyst reports the entry while counsel evaluates its effect. A closed status alone leaves the operating outcome unanswered.

Keep related debtors distinct

Federal Bankruptcy Rule 1015 contemplates joint administration of related cases involving a debtor and an affiliate. Connecticut's local rule expressly describes joint administration as procedural and generally requires each debtor to file specified documents in its own case absent substantive consolidation. Keep separate debtor records and link the relevant lead docket when the order directs that workflow. (www.law.cornell.edu) (www.ctb.uscourts.gov)

Likewise, distinguish a sale motion from authority and completion. Section 363 addresses use, sale, or lease of estate property outside the ordinary course after notice and a hearing, subject to its conditions. The statute is not evidence that any particular assets were offered or transferred. Read the case-specific documents before attaching an acquisition-related fact to the target. (uscode.house.gov)

Build the Debtor-Match Worksheet and Handoff

Use **one row per target-to-case candidate**, supplemented by a source log when several documents support a field. Separate debtor identifiers from target identifiers so that disagreement remains visible. The following is a proposed worksheet schema; empty values mean unanswered, not negative.

- **Target record:** internal target identifier, brand, legal name, formation jurisdiction, registry number.
- **Target evidence:** prior names, dated addresses, parent relationship, source links.
- **Query record:** exact search term, route, filters, timestamp, observed charge.

- **Case reference:** court, case number, chapter at filing, latest chapter observed.
- **Party evidence:** role, debtor name, aliases, business address, identifier provenance.
- **Case dates:** filed date, index closed date, latest event date, retrieval date.
- **Stage evidence:** docket entry number, document title, document date, relevant page.
- **Corroboration:** registry filing or dated company statement, source and retrieval date.
- **Conflict record:** inconsistent fields, competing candidates, missing documents.
- **Decision:** accepted match, rejected match, or unresolved hit, with written reasons.
- **Legal review:** flag, specific question, owner, and outstanding evidence.
- **Review history:** researcher, reviewer, decision date, earlier conclusion and correction reason.

[Open the CSV worksheet](data:text/csv;charset=utf-8,target_id%2Ctarget_legal_name%2Ctarget_formation_jurisdiction%2Ctarget_registry_number%2Ctarget_prior_names%2Ctarget_addresses%2Ctarget_parent%2C and save it locally, or copy the starter header below into a comma-separated values (**CSV**) file. Before entering candidates, append a comma followed by `chapter_at_filing,researcher,reviewer,decision_date,earlier_conclusion,correction_reason` to the header from either option. Use `chapter_at_filing` for the chapter at filing and `current_chapter` for the latest chapter observed. Record the researcher, reviewer, decision date, earlier conclusion, and correction reason in their respective fields; leave unanswered fields empty. Retain identifiers as text. Add candidates as rows and keep source details in the corresponding fields.

```
target_id,target_legal_name,target_formation_jurisdiction,target_registry_number,target_prior_names,target_addresses,target_parent,target_identifiers_source,search_term,search_route,search_filters,search_timestamp,observed_fee,court,case_number,party_role,debtor_name,debtor_aliases,debtor_addresses,debtor_identifiers,debtor_identifiers_source,filed_date,index_closed_date,current_chapter,stage,stage_evidence_document,stage_evidence_date,corroborating_source,conflicting_evidence,retrieval_date,match_decision,decision_reason,legal_review_flag,legal_review_question
```

Write a **bounded handoff sentence** from the evidence: identity decision, matched entity, court and case reference, specific dated event, retrieval timestamp, and unresolved question. Keep the evidence supporting the identity decision separate from the evidence supporting the event.

A registry result and a certified record are different artifacts. Delaware distinguishes its entity-status service from a certified good-standing certificate; Washington likewise says documents printed from filing history are not certified copies. Preserve the nature of the material collected, and ask counsel whether an authenticated or certified document is necessary for the contemplated diligence purpose. (corp.delaware.gov) (www.sos.wa.gov)

Cross-check dated company statements where they explain a name, address, group relationship, or transaction. Such statements should be preserved alongside the court and registry records, with their date and entity scope. They should not silently overwrite a contradictory filed document. When the discrepancy affects identity or legal effect, the worksheet remains unresolved until an identified reviewer addresses it.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The quantitative evidence here concerns **access cost, timing, and document fields**. It does not measure the probability that a screened company is a debtor. No search was conducted against a private target list, and this report reports no debtor prevalence, false-positive rate, or deal-conversion result.

Table 3 below separates current access rules from an announced change. The figures were checked for this report's October 2026 publication; the future announcement is not the current tariff.

Measure	Current or documented position	Research implication
Electronic access rate	$0.10 per page in the February 2026 manual, which excludes transcripts and reports that are not case-specific from the cap. (pacer.uscourts.gov)	Record observed charges and limit unnecessary searches.
Document cap versus search reports	Current pricing caps an eligible case document at $3, but searches have no maximum fee. (pacer.uscourts.gov)	Do not apply the document cap to name searches.
Quarterly billing threshold	Current pricing says users are billed when they accrue more than $30. (pacer.uscourts.gov)	Treat the threshold at account level, not as a per-target allowance.
Announced future rate	Announcement effective January 1, 2027 raises the rate from $0.10 to $0.12 per page. (pacer.uscourts.gov)	Update the cost assumptions before searches after implementation.
Announced future exemption	The same announcement raises the automatic quarterly exemption from $30 to $40. (pacer.uscourts.gov)	Preserve the effective date; do not apply the future threshold early.
Petition name-history window	Form 201 requests other names from the previous eight years. (www.uscourts.gov)	Search earlier periods separately when the target history warrants it.

These values describe access and evidence collection. A fee paid is not evidence that identity was resolved. Likewise, the petition's name-history window describes the form's request, not a guarantee that every relevant historical name appears or that an index search covers the target's entire history.

Currency matters at both the data and source levels. A nationwide result can lag the court record, and a saved result becomes historical evidence after retrieval. Retain a search timestamp, latest docket event reviewed, and proposed refresh trigger separately. A new legal name, contradictory registry record, or material docket event should prompt a targeted update, not a silent edit to the old conclusion.

The statutory materials also carry edition limits. The cited GovInfo text for closure and venue is the **2024 Code edition**, used here for the specified provisions rather than represented as a separately verified later codification. (www.govinfo.gov) Counsel should verify the governing law and current orders for the actual case.

The cost table intentionally omits an inferred future document cap. The announcement supports the stated future per-page charge and exemption; this workflow does not derive other future prices by multiplication. Maintain the difference between a verified published number, a calculation, and a field that remains unanswered.

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

The following **fictional examples** illustrate worksheet decisions. The company labels are invented and describe no actual business, filing, client, or acquisition target.

Accepted Match (Hypothetical Example)

Example Company Alpha is resolved to a particular corporation through a formation record and registry identifier. Its documented prior name appears in the petition's other-name field. The petition's business address agrees with the target's dated record, and an authorized business identifier corroborates the match. No material contradiction remains.

The reviewer accepts the **identity match** and writes only the event supported by the retained docket document. Acceptance does not approve an acquisition or characterize the business's financial condition. The next action depends on the mandate: preserve the evidence, refresh it before use, and submit the identified legal question to counsel.

Rejected Match (Hypothetical Example)

Example Company Beta shares a short name with an indexed debtor. The target's registry number and documented formation history identify a different entity, and the debtor's petition identifies a different business. A shared registered-office provider initially made the records appear closer than they were.

The reviewer rejects the match to the resolved target and retains the debtor as a rejected candidate with the reason. The rejection says nothing about other unsearched names or jurisdictions. It prevents the same false match from being reintroduced without preserving an unsupported negative conclusion about the company.

Unresolved Hit (Hypothetical Example)

Example Company Gamma uses a brand also used by a related operating company. The search finds an affiliated debtor, but the available material does not resolve the relationship between the brand, the target legal entity, and the named debtor. The petition needed for comparison is unavailable within the approved access scope.

The reviewer records **unresolved hit**, preserves both candidate entities, and specifies the missing document and relationship evidence. No insolvency label is added. The legal-review flag asks whether the identified case affects the proposed target or assets, while the identity question remains open.

Implications and Future Directions

The practical value of this protocol is a research record that survives handoff. A later reviewer should be able to see why the target was resolved, why a debtor was accepted or rejected, which event was observed, and which conclusion remained outside the evidence.

Corporate and case status should remain separate fields. California explicitly limits a foreign entity's California status to its California registration, while Delaware warns that its free search does not itself provide entity status. An active-looking registration result cannot replace a bankruptcy-stage review, and a case entry cannot replace entity-resolution work. (www.sos.ca.gov) (corp.delaware.gov)

Automated matching should preserve the same separation. Names, addresses, and dates can generate candidate pairs; the proposed workflow requires source-linked explanations before accepting them. GLEIF's distinction between a registration authority and its local EntityID offers a useful model for keeping identifier namespaces explicit. A missing identifier should remain missing instead of being filled through a name-only assumption. (www.gleif.org)

Case refreshes need similar discipline. The cited closure provision permits reopening for specified purposes, and the Justice Department's case-closing memorandum distinguishes confirmation from implementation sufficient for closure. A historical closed-date field should therefore remain attached to its source and retrieval period instead of becoming a permanent characterization of the operating company. (www.govinfo.gov) (www.justice.gov)

Future workflow improvements should be evaluated against concrete review questions: can another analyst reproduce the search scope, distinguish an affiliate from the target, locate the event document, and identify what counsel still needs? Until those questions can be answered, a faster match is only a faster candidate. This report proposes no numerical accuracy claim for the worksheet and no substitute for case-specific legal diligence.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

How can a researcher verify a company bankruptcy filing?

Resolve the company first, confirm the named party is the debtor, and compare the petition's identifiers with independent entity evidence. Use the docket and relevant filed document to support the event statement. Form 201 is the voluntary non-individual petition; avoid assuming it describes every petition type. (www.uscourts.gov)

How can affiliated bankruptcy debtors be distinguished?

Maintain a separate entity and case record for each debtor. Check the petition's related-case information and the joint-administration order. The voluntary petition requests pending or concurrently filed business-partner or affiliate cases; joint administration itself does not make separate debtor identities interchangeable. (www.uscourts.gov) (www.ctb.uscourts.gov)

Does a closed bankruptcy case mean the company closed?

The closed field alone cannot answer what happened to the operating business. The court FAQ specifically distinguishes closure from discharge. Review the relevant orders, plan or sale evidence, and dated corporate records before describing the business outcome. (www.cacb.uscourts.gov)

What should happen when the hit cannot be resolved?

Keep the identity decision unresolved, retain the candidates and conflicts, and request the specific missing evidence within the authorized research scope. Do not turn missing access into a clean screening result. Nor should a matched case be described as an available acquisition merely because a sale-related document exists.

Conclusion

Verifying debtor identity in PACER is a sequence of bounded findings. The researcher first resolves the acquisition candidate, then finds possible cases, confirms the party role, reconciles the debtor with the target, and reads the evidence needed for a dated stage statement. Each finding should retain its source and uncertainty.

The worksheet makes that discipline visible. It separates target identifiers from debtor identifiers, search coverage from match decisions, and case events from legal consequences. Accepted, rejected, and unresolved outcomes all have a place. An accepted match supports a relationship between records; it does not establish investment suitability. A rejected match preserves why a particular result concerns another entity. An unresolved hit identifies what remains necessary before a reviewer can decide.

For PE origination, the useful handoff is a narrow statement that another person can check. It names the resolved entity and case, identifies the event actually documented, states when the evidence was retrieved, and preserves the open question for legal diligence. It does not infer insolvency, ownership of sale assets, or purchase availability from a name search.

Use the protocol consistently, refresh the evidence when its intended use requires it, and retain earlier conclusions when correcting the record. That produces a more defensible screening file while keeping the transaction decision with the people and evidence needed to make it.

Source links

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

1. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/help/faqs/what-pacer-case-locator
2. https://www.sba.gov/counseling/launch-your-business
3. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/corp/instructions/401.shtml
4. https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/2025-04/b_201_0425-form.pdf
5. https://www.cacb.uscourts.gov/node/605
6. https://www.justice.gov/ust/rules-and-federal-register-notices/memorandum-understanding-regarding-case-closing
7. https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frbp/rule_6004
8. https://www.ctb.uscourts.gov/local-bankrr1015-1
9. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/files/PACER-User-Manual_2026.pdf
10. https://dos.ny.gov/node/35461
11. https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frbp/rule_1015
12. https://www.canb.uscourts.gov/faq/general-bankruptcy/how-do-i-find-out-if-someone-has-filed-bankruptcy
13. https://www.irs.gov/businesses/small-businesses-self-employed/bankruptcy-frequently-asked-questions
14. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/cbs-field-status-definitions
15. https://www.sos.wa.gov/corporations-charities/frequently-asked-questions-faqs/corporations-charities-filing-system-tools-resources
16. https://www.mass.gov/info-details/massachusetts-law-about-corporations
17. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/search/guides/fictitious-name
18. https://www.nj.gov/treasury/revenue/checkbusiness.shtml
19. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/find-case/search-national-index
20. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/help/faqs/what-information-needed-search-court-records-using-pacer
21. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/announcements/2025/03/07/coming-soon-changes-pcls-find-bankruptcy-ssnein-page
22. https://www.canb.uscourts.gov/faq/general-bankruptcy
23. https://www.irs.gov/businesses/employer-identification-number
24. https://www.sec.gov/submit-filings/filer-support-resources/how-do-i-guides/look-central-index-key-cik-number
25. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/code-lists/gleif-registration-authorities-list
26. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2024-title28/html/USCODE-2024-title28-partIV-chap87-sec1408.htm
27. https://www.uscourts.gov/court-programs/bankruptcy/bankruptcy-basics/chapter-11-bankruptcy-basics
28. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2024-title11/html/USCODE-2024-title11-chap3-subchapIII-sec350.htm
29. https://uscode.house.gov/us/usc/119-118/t11/s363
30. https://corp.delaware.gov/faqs
31. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/pacer-pricing-how-fees-work
32. https://pacer.uscourts.gov/announcements/2026/06/26/temporary-fee-increase-effective-jan-1-2027

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.