Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

How to Identify the Same Company Across State Registrations

> 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 · 2026-09-22 · company registration deduplication · business entity resolution · foreign qualification · secretary of state records · multi-state registration · legal entity identifier · market mapping · deal origination

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/deduplicate-company-registrations-across-states



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Domestic, Foreign, Assumed Name, and Subsidiary
4. Build a Canonical Entity Key
5. Read and Cross-Check a Foreign Registration
6. Linkage Rules and Reviewer Decisions
7. Lifecycle Events and False Duplicates
8. Implementation Crosswalk and Quality Assurance
9. Data Analysis and Evidence
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
12. Conclusion

Executive Summary

The reliable way to identify the same company across state registrations is to separate **legal identity** from **local authority**. A business is domestic in the jurisdiction under whose law it was formed and foreign in other states where it registers to transact business. The Small Business Administration states this distinction directly (sba.gov), while New York applies “foreign” to an organization formed in another U.S. state as well as another country (dos.ny.gov). A foreign qualification is therefore usually another registry record for the **same legal person**, not evidence of a newly formed subsidiary.

The strongest canonical key is **formation jurisdiction plus the formation-jurisdiction identifier**. A local registration number belongs in the source record, but it cannot replace the home identifier. California, for example, assigns its own number when an entity registers there (sos.ca.gov), and Delaware defines its file number as unique to an entity formed, qualified, or registered in Delaware (icis.corp.delaware.gov). These are jurisdiction-scoped identifiers. The recommended sequence is: anchor the domestic record, collect every raw foreign record, extract original name and home jurisdiction, inspect filing images, then assign one of three outcomes: **accepted link**, **manual review**, or **keep separate**.

Names, agents, addresses, and status are supporting evidence, not merge keys. Multiple businesses can use the same doing-business-as name within one state (sba.gov), commercial registered agents may serve many entities (uniformlaws.org), and a foreign entity’s California status describes only its California registration (sos.ca.gov). A withdrawal or revoked authority should not be interpreted as dissolution without checking the home record.

For operations teams, the defensible control is to preserve raw rows and source images, record the rationale for every union, and measure **duplicate burden** separately from market coverage. In a labeled hypothetical example below, 12 registry rows resolve to 7 accepted entities, producing a workflow burden of **41.7%**, calculated as `(12 - 7) / 12`. That percentage describes review duplication, not the share of a market mapped. Census record-linkage standards call for manual review of automated links and documentation

sufficient to reproduce the operation (census.gov). The practical rule is simple: exact official identifier evidence can create an auto-candidate, name plus home jurisdiction plus dates requires review, and **name or agent alone never justifies a merge**.

Introduction and Background

A multi-state business registration lookup often returns what appear to be several companies with nearly identical names. For a private equity origination team, the question is not merely whether the records resemble each other. It is whether they refer to one legal person that obtained authority in several jurisdictions, separate subsidiaries under common ownership, a renamed or converted predecessor, or unrelated companies whose names happen to collide.

This distinction changes the denominator of a market map. Counting each registry row as a target overstates the reachable universe and creates repeat review. Collapsing real subsidiaries into a parent has the opposite effect: it can hide operating entities, misdirect outreach, and erase useful corporate structure. Official registration data is fragmented by design. The National Association of Secretaries of State provides a state-by-state directory rather than one national registry (nass.org). OpenCorporates describes the practical model as **jurisdiction plus company number** (blog.opencorporates.com), an observation that is consistent with how individual states define their own identifiers.

The method below is designed for reproducible **business entity resolution across state registries**. It treats each state page as a source record, not as a company. It preserves uncertainty rather than forcing a match, and it gives filing images more weight than normalized directory fields. Docket's own research model is relevant as an operating control because each researched answer retains its source, excerpt, and collection date; its library likewise emphasizes that guides should explain evidentiary limits. The same principles apply to a registry crosswalk: retain what was observed, distinguish inference from fact, and keep unresolved records visible.

Domestic, Foreign, Assumed Name, and Subsidiary

Domestic versus foreign business entity registration

Domestic registration is the formation record in the jurisdiction whose law created the entity. **Foreign qualification** is the authority that the same entity obtains elsewhere. The Uniform Law Commission describes foreign entities as those formed under another state's organic statute (uniformlaws.org). The SBA says a business active in multiple states may need foreign qualification outside its formation state (sba.gov).

That produces two classes of records:

- **Domestic anchor:** The constitutive record, ideally carrying the formation number, legal name, type, and formation date.
- **Foreign authority record:** A local record that should point back to the home jurisdiction and original legal name.
- **Local identifier:** A number assigned by the destination state for administration of the qualification.

- **Authority date:** The date the destination state accepted or made effective the registration, which is not necessarily the entity's birth date.

New York makes the legal effect clear: a foreign organization obtains authority by making a filing, rather than being formed again there (dos.ny.gov). Texas similarly says that an application for registration gives the foreign filing entity authority to transact business in the state (sos.state.tx.us). Thus, "foreign qualification, same legal entity" is the default hypothesis when the destination filing explicitly identifies the home record. It is not a conclusion that should be inferred from name similarity alone.

Assumed names are aliases, not new legal persons

An assumed, fictitious, or doing-business-as name can be a local alias. Texas says an entity may keep its legal name while conducting business under another name (sos.state.tx.us). Pennsylvania is even more explicit: use of a fictitious name does not create a separate legal entity (pa.gov).

Aliases are weak match evidence because they are not necessarily exclusive. Pennsylvania permits different parties to register the same fictitious name (pa.gov), and Florida says a fictitious-name registration does not prohibit someone else from using the same name (fl.gov). California adds a jurisdictional wrinkle: fictitious-business-name statements are county filings, not Secretary of State entity records (sos.ca.gov).

A subsidiary is a different legal person

A subsidiary is not a foreign registration of its parent. It has its own formation record and usually its own home-jurisdiction identifier. A shared brand, website, address, executive, or registered agent can support an affiliation finding, but none changes that legal separation. Where available, an independent global identifier can help: the Global Legal Entity Identifier Foundation says every Legal Entity Identifier (LEI) represents only one entity (gleif.org), while its Level 2 data separately identifies direct and ultimate accounting-consolidating parents (gleif.org). Identity and ownership are different relationships and should occupy different fields.

Build a Canonical Entity Key

The canonical key should be **formation jurisdiction + formation identifier**. It answers "which legal person is this?" while leaving each local number attached to the state record that issued it. A display ID might look like `US-DE:1234567`, but the stored values should remain separate fields so formatting changes do not destroy provenance.

The priority order is:

1. **Official cross-reference to the home number.** Use the formation number asserted in a foreign application or filing image, then verify it in the home registry.
2. **Home jurisdiction plus exact legal name and formation date.** This is a manual-review candidate when the foreign record omits the home number.
3. **Original name and documented amendments.** Follow a name history through state filing images rather than normalizing away the difference.

4. **Independent identifiers.** Use LEI, Central Index Key (CIK), or Employer Identification Number (EIN) only with their documented scope and limitations.
5. **Supporting attributes.** Addresses, agents, managers, websites, and telephone numbers can corroborate a link but should not create it alone.

Why not use one state number everywhere? California defines its entity number as the identifier assigned by California (sos.ca.gov). Florida assigns a document number when an entity or registration is filed there (fl.gov). Each number is authoritative inside its own system, but neither is automatically the other state's formation number.

Independent identifiers also require care:

- **LEI:** The standard associates an entity with its local registry identifier (gleif.org). Coverage is not universal, and a lapsed LEI does not mean the entity is inactive (gleif.org).
- **CIK:** Securities and Exchange Commission CIKs are unique to a filer and are not recycled (sec.gov). Yet the list includes funds and individuals as well as companies, and one filer can have multiple historical names (sec.gov).
- **EIN:** The Internal Revenue Service says one business entity should have only one EIN (irs.gov). An EIN can persist after a name or address change, but a change in ownership or structure generally requires a new one (irs.gov).

Table 1 ranks common linkage fields by what they can establish.

Field or document	Identity value	Use in matching	Failure mode
Home jurisdiction + formation number	**Highest**	Auto-candidate after both official records agree	Number may be omitted or reformatted
Foreign application or filing image	**High**	Read asserted original name, jurisdiction, date, and home ID	Structured index may expose fewer fields
LEI mapped to local registry ID	**High when present**	Independent bridge and ownership context	Coverage and renewal status vary
Exact legal name + jurisdiction + formation date	**Medium**	Manual review candidate	Names change and dates may mean registration, not formation
Local state file number	**High within one state**	Retrieve history and deduplicate repeated snapshots	Not portable across jurisdictions
Assumed or fictitious name	**Low**	Alias search and discovery only	Different parties may use the same name
Registered agent or address	**Low**	Corroboration and blocking only	Commercial agents represent many entities
Status label	**Context only**	Interpret local authority at the observation date	Local status does not establish home existence

The table's main implication is that a canonical key is an evidence-backed assertion, not a normalized company name. When the home number is absent, the correct output is often "review," not a guessed identifier.

Read and Cross-Check a Foreign Registration

A foreign-registration record should be read as a structured claim about a home entity. Researchers should capture every field before deciding whether to link it.

Extract the record in a fixed order

- **Local state and record ID:** Preserve exactly as displayed, including leading zeros and punctuation.
- **Current legal name:** Record capitalization and suffix without treating formatting as identity.
- **Original or formation name:** Search amendments and images when the current name differs.
- **Entity type:** Corporation, limited liability company, limited partnership, or another form.
- **Home jurisdiction:** Record the state, country, or other organizing jurisdiction.
- **Asserted formation ID:** Keep the home number separately from the local registration number.
- **Formation and authority dates:** Label each date by meaning rather than putting both in a generic date field.
- **Local assumed name:** Preserve it as an alias linked to the registration.
- **Agent and address:** Retain as supporting attributes with effective dates when available.
- **Status and status scope:** Note whether it describes the local registration or the underlying entity.
- **Source URL and access date:** Store both the index page and any filing image used.

State schemas differ. New York's searchable record supplies current name, organization date, and jurisdiction (dos.ny.gov), and a request can use either the DOS ID or exact formation or authorization date (dos.ny.gov). Massachusetts foreign limited liability company registrations record both home jurisdiction and home organization date (state.ma.us). Georgia's public detail records can show a foreign jurisdiction and annual-registration year together (ga.gov).

Dates require semantic checking. Florida's effective date can differ from the filing date (fl.gov), while California's registration-date definition covers both California-formed entities and foreign entities registered there (sos.ca.gov). A date labeled "registration" should never be silently reclassified as the original formation date.

Inspect filing images, not only the index

Filing images can resolve renamed entities, alternate names, conversions, and cross-references. California offers copies of formation or registration, amendment, termination, and information-statement filings (sos.ca.gov). Florida lets researchers open filed documents as PDFs (fl.gov). Washington makes entity

documents accessible without a login (sos.wa.gov).

Where images are unavailable, record that limitation. Do not upgrade a structured-field match into a documentary match. A missing foreign record is also not proof that a company has no activity in the state. Registration thresholds, exemptions, filing delays, name-search behavior, and data availability can all affect discovery.

Linkage Rules and Reviewer Decisions

The safest implementation resembles a union-find process with evidentiary gates. Each raw state record begins as its own node. A union operation is proposed only when evidence connects two nodes to the same legal person.

Three decision thresholds

1. Auto-candidate, exact official identifier link

- The foreign filing states the home jurisdiction and formation number.
- The home registry returns that number with a compatible legal name and entity type.
- Any name difference is explained by an amendment, assumed name, or filed conversion.
- The system proposes a union, but stores both source records and the rule that fired.

2. Manual review, composite evidence

- Names match after conservative normalization.
- Home jurisdiction matches exactly.
- Formation date, original name, address history, or filed certificate corroborates the pair.
- No reliable home number is exposed, or one source conflicts with another.

3. No merge, weak or conflicting evidence

- Only a name, agent, mailing address, website, or telephone number matches.
- Home jurisdictions differ without a documented conversion.
- Formation numbers conflict.
- Entity types or timelines are incompatible.

This structure follows established linkage practice. The U.K. Office for National Statistics defines deterministic methods as exact matching (ons.gov.uk) and probabilistic linkage as estimating the likelihood that a record pair matches (ons.gov.uk). Pairs between thresholds should receive clerical review (ons.gov.uk).

Why name and agent cannot decide the match

Company name variations across state filings can arise from suffix rules, punctuation, a legal name change, or an unavailable local name. A name filing itself may not authorize business: Texas says reserving or registering a name does not confer authority to transact business (sos.state.tx.us). Georgia likewise warns that a Secretary of State name filing is not name protection (sos.ga.gov).

Registered agents are intentionally reusable. Delaware requires every entity to appoint one (delaware.gov), and Georgia notes that service companies can serve in that role (ga.gov). An agent match is therefore useful for search blocking, not identity adjudication.

Store the rationale, not just the result

Every accepted or rejected edge should carry:

- **Rule ID:** Such as `HOME_ID_EXACT` or `NAME_JURIS_DATE_REVIEW`.
- **Evidence pointers:** URLs, images, fields, and captured excerpts.
- **Observed date:** When each source was accessed.
- **Decision:** Accepted, rejected, or unresolved.
- **Reviewer:** Human or automated process responsible for the decision.
- **Contradictions:** Values that did not agree and how they were treated.

Census standards require documentation sufficient to replicate and evaluate linkage operations (census.gov). That is the core quality-control requirement for deduplicating Secretary of State business records.

Lifecycle Events and False Duplicates

Name changes and amendments

A current name is a point-in-time field. Delaware notes that the displayed name may reflect subsequent amendments (delaware.gov). SEC data similarly allows one CIK to be associated with multiple names (sec.gov). Build an alias history with effective dates rather than overwriting the old name.

Conversion and domestication

A conversion may preserve continuity while changing type or jurisdiction. Texas conversion records can preserve the prior entity's formation date, type, and jurisdiction (sos.state.tx.us). Pennsylvania's domestication form treats the domesticated entity as the same entity that existed before the event (pa.gov). A changed home jurisdiction therefore demands a dated continuity edge, not an automatic rejection.

Merger

A merger can end one legal identity while another survives. Delaware's "Merged" status means the displayed entity did not survive and was merged into another (delaware.gov). That is not ordinary deduplication. Preserve predecessor and survivor as separate canonical entities connected by a merger relationship.

Withdrawal, surrender, cancellation, and revocation

Local authority can end while the home entity continues. New York states that a surrendering foreign corporation remains in existence in its home state (dos.ny.gov). California defines a canceled foreign registration as no longer authorized to transact intrastate business there (sos.ca.gov). Neither statement, by itself, establishes dissolution of the legal person.

Status must be scoped and dated:

- **Home status:** Existence or standing in the formation jurisdiction.
- **Local authority status:** Whether the foreign registration currently authorizes business in that state.
- **Event status:** Converted, merged, withdrawn, surrendered, canceled, or terminated.
- **Observation date:** The date on which the status was retrieved.

Pennsylvania illustrates why history matters: a terminated foreign registration that later re-registers can receive a new local entity or file number (pa.gov). Without the old record and event trail, one legal entity can look like two unrelated local registrations.

Implementation Crosswalk and Quality Assurance

Table 2 provides the requested domestic and foreign registration crosswalk. Its rows are explicitly fictional and demonstrate the schema, not real acquisition targets.

State record ID	Legal name	Type	Home jurisdiction	Asserted formation ID	Foreign qualification date	Local assumed name	Agent	Address	Status	Source URL/date	Canonical entity ID	Link rationale	Reviewer decision
DE 7654321	Northstar Pump Holdings, LLC	LLC	Delaware	7654321	Not applicable	None	Agent Alpha	Wilmington, DE	Active	Fictional source, 2026-09-22	US-DE:7654321	Domestic anchor	Accepted
TX 0809999999	Northstar Pump Holdings, LLC	Foreign LLC	Delaware	7654321	2022-04-18	Northstar Pumps Texas	Agent Beta	Austin, TX	Inexistence	Fictional source, 2026-09-22	US-DE:7654321	Exact asserted home ID verified against anchor	Accepted
NY 7777777	Northstar Pump Holdings LLC	Foreign LLC	Delaware	Not displayed	2022-06-07	None	Secretary of State	Albany, NY	Active	Fictional source, 2026-09-22	Pending	Name, jurisdiction, and date pattern only	Manual review

State record ID	Legal name	Type	Home jurisdiction	Asserted formation ID	Foreign qualification date	Local assumed name	Agent	Address	Status	Source URL/date	Canonical entity ID	Link rationale	Reviewer decision
FL L24000000001	Northstar Pump Services, LLC	LLC	Florida	L24000000001	Not applicable	None	Agent Alpha	Tampa, FL	Active	Fictional source, 2026-09-22	US-FL:L24000000001	Separate domestic formation and different legal name	Keep separate
GA 26000001	Northstar Pump Holdings, LLC	Foreign LLC	Nevada	Not displayed	2026-01-12	None	Agent Alpha	Atlanta, GA	Active	Fictional source, 2026-09-22	Pending	Name and agent match, but home jurisdiction conflicts	Keep separate pending evidence

The crosswalk prevents two common errors. The New York row is not merged merely because three attributes align, and the Florida subsidiary is not collapsed into its similarly named Delaware parent. The Georgia row remains separate because a shared name and agent cannot overcome a conflicting home jurisdiction.

Operational QA checklist

- **Preserve raw records:** Never delete source rows after canonicalization.
- **Retain images:** Save the formation, qualification, amendment, conversion, merger, and withdrawal documents used.
- **Separate observed from inferred:** Keep raw field values apart from normalized values and reviewer conclusions.
- **Version decisions:** Re-running linkage should create a new decision version, not overwrite the old one.
- **Refresh selectively:** Recheck unresolved links, active target records, and time-sensitive status fields first.
- **Compare histories:** Look for name, number, and jurisdiction changes before declaring a collision.
- **Audit samples:** Manually review accepted and rejected pairs, not only ambiguous ones.
- **Escalate terminology:** Have counsel review terminology and jurisdiction-specific interpretation, not make transaction conclusions from the crosswalk.

California provides a useful example of status scoping: a foreign entity’s status applies only to its California registration (sos.ca.gov). New York provides a different limitation: its database generally does not maintain officers’ names and addresses (dos.ny.gov). Quality assurance must therefore be jurisdiction-aware rather than built around a presumed national schema.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The main quantitative opportunity is not a national “duplicate-company rate,” because no authoritative source establishes one for state registries. It is measurement of the team’s own linkage workload and error controls.

Workflow metrics

Table 3 uses a hypothetical batch to distinguish operational duplication from market coverage. The example begins with **12** raw registry rows and ends with **7** accepted unique legal entities after review.

Metric	Formula	Hypothetical result	Interpretation
Duplicate burden	`(raw rows - accepted unique entities) / raw rows`	`(12 - 7) / 12 = 41.7%`	Share of ingested rows removed from the working entity count; a workflow metric only
Candidate compression	`accepted unique entities / raw rows`	`7 / 12 = 58.3%`	How many canonical entities remain per imported row
Manual-review rate	`pairs sent to review / candidate pairs`	`6 / 20 = 30.0%`	Reviewer load created by the threshold policy
Auto-candidate precision	`correct auto-links / accepted auto-links`	`9 / 10 = 90.0%`	Sampled correctness of the deterministic rule
Universe coverage	`verified unique legal entities / estimated in-scope universe`	Not calculated	Requires an independently estimated universe, not registry-row counts

These figures are constructed examples, not external benchmarks. The essential distinction is that **41.7% duplicate burden does not mean 41.7% market coverage**. Registry rows are observations, while the market-map denominator should consist of estimated in-scope legal entities or operating businesses under a stated definition.

The linkage literature supplies more useful evaluation concepts than a generic accuracy score. Two datasets with 100 records each create 10,000 possible cross-file pairs before blocking (ons.gov.uk). Blocking by home jurisdiction and a conservative name key reduces comparisons, but should never become evidence for a merge. ONS recommends reporting precision and recall for linkage quality (ons.gov.uk).

Useful internal metrics include:

- **Precision:** Among accepted links, the share that are correct after review.
- **Recall:** Among true cross-state links in an audited sample, the share the process found.
- **Unresolved rate:** Records left separate because evidence was incomplete or conflicting.
- **Reversal rate:** Prior decisions changed after new filings or better evidence appeared.
- **Evidence completeness:** Accepted links containing both source records, a rationale, and a filing image where available.

Scale also explains why universal identifiers are helpful but insufficient. GLEIF reported more than **3.35 million** LEIs in its 2026 second-quarter population (gleif.org), with an overall renewal rate of **57.1%** (gleif.org). LEI is a strong corroborating bridge when present, but state filings remain necessary for entities outside that system and for local authority history.

Implications and Future Directions

For origination teams, the immediate implication is that registry ingestion and target counting must be separate stages. A source connector can collect rows quickly, but a market map should count only canonical entities after the linkage policy has run. Outreach should use the reviewed legal entity and operating identity, while preserving local registrations as evidence rather than treating each as a contactable target.

Four design choices make the process durable:

- **Model relationships explicitly:** Distinguish same legal person, parent-subsidiary, predecessor-successor, alias, and possible match.
- **Use temporal fields:** Attach effective dates to names, jurisdictions, identifiers, agents, and statuses.
- **Keep jurisdiction adapters:** Map each state's terms into a common schema without erasing the source label.
- **Retain uncertainty:** An unresolved edge is valid data, not a processing failure.

The direction of travel is toward richer cross-references, but not necessarily one universal U.S. number. SEC submissions metadata already includes current and former names, exchanges, and tickers (sec.gov), and LEI Level 1 data includes official name and registered address (gleif.org). These systems can improve corroboration, but the domestic anchor and official state filing history remain the foundation for ordinary private-company resolution.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

How do teams match business entities across states?

Start with the domestic formation record, then compare each foreign filing's home jurisdiction and asserted formation number. Exact official identifier agreement creates an auto-candidate. If the number is absent, use legal name, original name, jurisdiction, entity type, and formation date for manual review. Use agents and addresses only as corroboration. Pennsylvania's record-search service can provide an exact name, entity number, filing date, and effective date (pa.gov).

Does foreign qualification create a separate company?

Usually no. It normally gives an entity formed elsewhere authority to transact business in the destination state. New York says a surrendered foreign corporation remains in existence in its home state (dos.ny.gov). A separately formed subsidiary, by contrast, has its own domestic formation record.

Can company names identify duplicate company registrations?

Not by themselves. Names can change, collide, or be replaced with local assumed names. Florida even warns that multiple entities may appear under a single Federal Employer Identification search value (fl.gov). A match needs official identifiers or a reviewed combination of jurisdiction, names, dates, type, and filing documents.

What is the safest way to deduplicate Secretary of State business records?

Keep every raw record, create a canonical entity table, and store a many-to-one mapping with evidence and decision history. Do not overwrite local IDs. Use deterministic links for exact official cross-references, manual review for composite matches, and no merge for name or agent alone. Census linkage guidance supports explicit weights and cutoffs (census.gov) and manual review of automated links (census.gov).

What if the local status is inactive, withdrawn, or canceled?

Treat the label as a statement about that jurisdiction until the home record proves otherwise. Delaware defines a withdrawn foreign status as termination of authority to transact business there (delaware.gov). Check home status, filing history, and any merger, conversion, or termination document before changing the canonical entity.

How should a multi-state business registration lookup handle missing fields?

Record the field as unavailable, not as negative evidence. Follow the state directory to the authoritative portal, inspect filed documents, and document which sources were checked. New York's computerized system includes complete filing histories for active corporations within its covered types (dos.ny.gov), while other jurisdictions expose different fields or require document orders. Ambiguous records should remain separate until corroborated.

Conclusion

Identifying the same company across state registrations is an evidence-resolution problem, not a fuzzy-name exercise. The correct unit is the legal entity, anchored by formation jurisdiction and formation identifier. Foreign qualifications, assumed names, and local file numbers should remain attached as jurisdiction-specific records, while subsidiaries, merger parties, and converted entities retain the relationships appropriate to their legal continuity.

A reliable process therefore has three outcomes rather than one: link when official identifiers establish the same legal person, review when jurisdiction, name, and dated filings support but do not prove the connection, and keep records separate when only names, agents, or addresses overlap. Filing images and event histories matter because current fields can conceal amendments, conversions, withdrawals, and prior registrations.

For private equity origination teams, this discipline produces a defensible target-universe denominator and reduces repeated research without erasing uncertainty. Preserve the raw records, version every decision, and report duplicate burden as an operational metric distinct from market coverage. The result is not merely a cleaner database. It is a traceable explanation of why each registry row does, or does not, belong to the same legal company.

Source links

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

1. https://www.sba.gov/counseling/launch-your-business
2. https://dos.ny.gov/node/14141
3. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/cbs-field-status-definitions
4. https://icis.corp.delaware.gov/ecorp/FieldDesc.aspx
5. https://www.uniformlaws.org/HigherLogic/System/DownloadDocumentFile.ashx?DocumentFileKey=1c81e016-7479-41f3-56a1-d1e5e711dd34&forceDialog=0
6. https://www.census.gov/about/policies/quality/standards/standardc4.html
7. https://www.nass.org/business-services/corporate-registration
8. https://blog.opencorporates.com/2026/03/26/the-local-company-number-problem
9. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/corp/namefilingsfaqs.shtml
10. https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dos/programs/business/types-of-filings-and-registrations/fictitious-names
11. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/start-business/efile/fl-fictitious-name-registration
12. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/business-entities/information-requests
13. https://www.gleif.org/en/organizational-identity/lei-vlei/the-legal-entity-identifier-lei
14. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/access-and-use-lei-data/level-2-data-who-owns-whom
15. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/search/guides/corporation-records
16. https://www.gleif.org/content/4_lei-data/1_access-and-use-lei-data/2_level-1-data-lei-cdf-3-1-format/lei-cdf_version_3.1-documentation.html
17. https://www.gleif.org/en/lei-data/lei-search/about-lei-search/how-to-use-lei-search
18. https://www.sec.gov/search-filings/edgar-search-assistance/accessing-edgar-data
19. https://www.irs.gov/businesses/employer-identification-number
20. https://dos.ny.gov/node/35461
21. https://www.sec.state.ma.us/divisions/corporations/filing-by-subject/limited-liability/corporations-foreign-limited-liability-company.htm
22. https://ecorp.sos.ga.gov/BusinessSearch/BusinessInformation?businessId=2220224
23. https://www.sos.wa.gov/vi/node/11815
24. https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/methodologicalpublications/generalmethodology/onsworkingpaperseries/developingstandardtoolsfordatalinkagefebruary2021
25. https://sos.ga.gov/page/business-division-faq
26. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/corp/mergersfaqs.shtml
27. https://www.pa.gov/content/dam/copapwp-pagov/en/dos/programs/business/forms/offsite-forms/15-375-Statement-of-Domestication.pdf
28. https://dos.ny.gov/node/14876
29. https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dos/programs/business/types-of-filings-and-registrations/annual-reports
30. https://www.gleif.org/lei-data/global-lei-index/download-global-lei-system-business-reports/download-global-lei-system-business-report-q2-2026/q2-2026-quarterly_business_report.pdf

31. https://www.sec.gov/search-filings/edgar-application-programming-interfaces
32. https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dos/programs/business/information-services/record-searches

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.