Docket

DOCKET / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

UCC Lien Search for Private Equity: Proof and Gaps

> 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 · ucc lien search · ucc search · private equity · deal origination · due diligence · financing statement · secured transactions · target research · ucc filing

Original article: https://docket.capital/articles/ucc-lien-searches-pe-origination

In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. What a UCC Financing Statement Shows
4. Choosing the Filing Office
5. Building the Debtor-Name Set
6. Reading the Filing Lifecycle
7. PE Origination Triage and Escalation
8. Evidence Capture and Reproducible Worksheet
9. State and Territory Filing-Office Directory
10. Data Analysis and Evidence
11. Implications and Future Directions
12. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
13. Conclusion

Executive Summary

A **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) lien search** can improve private-equity origination triage, but only if the analyst treats it as a public-record lead rather than a credit conclusion. A UCC financing statement gives public notice of a creditor's claimed interest in collateral (nass.org). New York describes the UCC-1 even more plainly: **it is not an agreement** (dos.ny.gov). It therefore does not, by itself, establish a current debt balance, default, enterprise value, or lien priority.

The first decision is **where to search**. A registered organization organized under state law is generally located in that state for Article 9 purposes (law.cornell.edu). That rule points an analyst toward the jurisdiction of organization, not merely headquarters, operating address, or brand geography. Important exceptions include fixture filings and records covering as-extracted collateral or timber, which generally go to the real-property recording office. Any cross-border, individual-debtor, trust, relocation, conversion, or exception question should be escalated to qualified counsel.

The second decision is **which names to search**. A trade name alone is insufficient (delcode.delaware.gov). Search the exact current legal name, then documented former names and relevant variants. California's rules show why this matters: the submitted name is processed exactly, human judgment does not determine the result, and name variances are not returned (sos.ca.gov).

The recommended output is a **dated evidence packet**, not a yes-or-no flag. Record the jurisdiction, debtor name and version, entity identifier, exact portal query, filing number, filing type, status, dates, collateral text, document image, source URL, collection time, and reviewer question. Link amendments, assignments, continuations, and terminations to the initial statement. The standard period is **five years**, subject to exceptions, and a continuation is generally filed only in the final **six months**. A portal result can change triage or prompt a certified search, but it should remain an unresolved diligence question until documents, filing-office coverage, and counsel's legal analysis support a stronger conclusion.

Introduction and Background

For an origination analyst, the practical question is not whether a filing is “good” or “bad.” It is whether the record is relevant enough to change early target triage, broaden the search, or trigger specialist review. **UCC search due diligence** is useful because financing statements can reveal named secured parties, filing dates, collateral descriptions, and subsequent records. Yet the same result is easy to overread because the index is an administrative notice system, not a live ledger of borrower obligations.

The Uniform Law Commission says each state maintains an office for publicly filing financing statements (uniformlaws.org). The National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) then links users to the state or territory of interest (nass.org). Those two facts make the search look simple. In practice, the correct office depends on debtor type, location rules, collateral, and exceptions. Search logic and available documents also vary by filing office.

This report supplies the missing decision layer for **UCC filings for deal origination**. It explains what a filing proves, how to choose an office, how to build a defensible debtor-name set, how to read the filing lifecycle, and when to escalate. It is an educational research workflow, not legal advice, a lien-priority opinion, or a substitute for a certified search and qualified counsel.

Docket says each researched answer includes its source, supporting excerpt, and collection date (docket.capital). That evidence pattern is relevant here: a UCC observation should be reviewable and reproducible, while any unsupported inference stays visibly unresolved.

What a UCC Financing Statement Shows

Public notice, not a balance sheet

A **UCC financing statement** is a public notice associated with a claimed security interest in collateral. Delaware describes sufficient contents as including the debtor and secured-party names and addresses (corp.delaware.gov), plus a collateral statement (corp.delaware.gov). Those fields identify a filing and its claimed scope. They do not state a current payoff amount, covenant compliance, payment performance, or default status.

The distinction is structural. A financing statement can precede the security agreement or attachment of a security interest (law.cornell.edu). Delaware law also provides, for transactions addressed by its Section 9-505(a), that filing is not by itself a factor in deciding whether collateral secures an obligation (delcode.delaware.gov). The analyst should therefore report **“filing located”**, not **“debt confirmed.”**

What the record can establish

Subject to portal coverage and document availability, an initial filing and its related records can establish observable facts:

- **Debtor identity:** the name printed in the record and sometimes its address.
- **Secured party:** the named secured party or representative, which may change through assignment.

- **Filing chronology:** initial filing date, file number, later record types, and recorded dates.
- **Collateral language:** specific asset classes, described equipment, or broad language.
- **Administrative status:** active, unlapsed, lapsed, or terminated labels as the filing office presents them.
- **Document availability:** whether the portal exposes an image, copy order, or certified search route.

Article 9 permits collateral language as broad as **“all assets”** or **“all personal property”** (law.cornell.edu). That wording is relevant to early triage because it is broader than an equipment-specific description. It still does not quantify debt, establish priority, or value the collateral.

What the record does not establish

The disciplined analyst preserves the following non-inferences:

- **No result is not no debt.** The search may have used the wrong jurisdiction, an incomplete name set, a portal scope limited to unlapsed filings, or an index that does not return variants.
- **A filing is not proof of default.** The public notice function does not report payment performance.
- **A broad description is not enterprise value.** “All assets” describes claimed collateral scope, not realizable value or capital structure.
- **A termination is not universal clearance.** It changes the effectiveness of the statement to which it relates, not every possible obligation or record.
- **A portal label is not a priority opinion.** Priority may depend on facts and law outside the result page.
- **A UCC result is not every lien.** A Notice of Federal Tax Lien is a distinct public document used to alert creditors to the government's claimed legal right to property (irs.gov).

Choosing the Filing Office

Start with debtor type and legal location

For a domestic registered organization, begin with the state under whose law the entity was organized. Do not substitute a mailing address, headquarters, major plant, or “doing business as” name for this analysis. For an individual, the general rule points to the principal residence (law.cornell.edu). Trusts, federally organized entities, foreign organizations, relocations, and structural changes require more careful review.

The office-selection sequence should be:

1. **Classify the debtor:** registered organization, other organization, individual, trust, or special statutory type.
2. **Confirm formation evidence:** obtain the current registry record and jurisdiction of organization.
3. **Check transaction history:** identify mergers, conversions, domestications, name changes, and prior jurisdictions.

4. **Classify collateral:** distinguish ordinary personal property from fixtures, as-extracted collateral, and timber to be cut.
5. **Identify special systems:** consider tax liens, titled property, intellectual-property records, and local real-property records separately.
6. **Escalate ambiguity:** ask counsel to confirm the governing rule before treating a search as complete.

Table 1 translates those steps into a filing-office decision table. It is a research routing tool, not a legal conclusion.

Debtor or collateral fact	Initial search route	Evidence to retain	Counsel question
Domestic registered organization	Central UCC office in the jurisdiction of organization	Registry extract, entity identifier, legal name, formation state	Do any relocation, conversion, or successor rules change the relevant period?
Individual debtor	Office indicated by the applicable principal-residence rule	Full legal name, address evidence, search logic used	Which individual-name rule and residence date apply?
Multiple locations or nonregistered organization	Determine Article 9 location before selecting the office	Place-of-business and chief-executive-office evidence	Which location rule controls for this debtor type?
Fixtures, as-extracted collateral, or timber	Local office that records real-property mortgages, subject to applicable law	Property county, legal description, local index query	Is a fixture filing or another real-property record required?
Federal tax lien concern	Search the applicable official tax-lien record system in addition to UCC	Notice type, filing office, taxpayer name, dates	Which non-UCC lien systems are relevant?
Unclear, foreign, trust, federal, or reorganized debtor	Hold the issue open and obtain specialist direction	Organizational documents, timeline, jurisdictions considered	What law governs location, perfection, and search scope?

The table prevents a common error: treating every collateral record as a Secretary of State search. California, for example, directs certain fixture, as-extracted collateral, and timber filings to the county where real-property mortgages are filed (sos.ca.gov).

Building the Debtor-Name Set

Begin with the public organic record

A **brand name alone is insufficient**. For a registered organization, start with the exact name stated in the relevant public organic record. California advises checking registration documents for the correct name (sos.ca.gov). Article 9 connects the debtor name to the registered organization's public organic record, including the most recently filed record that purports to state or change the name (delcode.delaware.gov).

Build a **name-evidence file** before touching the UCC portal:

- **Current exact legal name:** preserve punctuation, entity suffix, spacing, and capitalization as shown.
- **Entity identifier:** use the registry number to separate similarly named organizations.
- **Former legal names:** identify filed amendments and effective dates.
- **Predecessors and successors:** capture merger, conversion, and domestication records.
- **Trade names and brands:** record them for context, but do not substitute them for the legal name.
- **Likely portal variants:** use only as supplementary searches and label each query exactly.

California's entity filing history can include an amendment, merger, conversion, election to terminate, or termination (bpd.cdn.sos.ca.gov). That history supplies a dated chain for the search set and another reason to retain exact dates and send close cases to counsel.

Treat portal search logic as evidence

Search behavior is part of the result. California processes the name in the exact form submitted (sos.ca.gov). Its system does not use human judgment to determine results, and its debtor search does not reflect name variances (sos.ca.gov). California also says the correctness of indexed filer-supplied names is not verified (sos.ca.gov).

Accordingly, preserve each query as a separate observation. A useful search log records **"Acme Industrial Holdings, LLC"** and **"Acme Industrial Holdings LLC"** as distinct entries if the portal behavior makes that distinction relevant. A zero-result screenshot without the exact query, jurisdiction, scope, and time is weak evidence.

Reading the Filing Lifecycle

An initial statement is only the beginning. Analysts should assemble a **filing family** by file number and read every related record in date order. An amendment can add or delete collateral, continue or terminate effectiveness, or otherwise amend a financing statement (law.cornell.edu). An assignment amendment supplies the assignee's name and mailing address (law.cornell.edu).

Table 2 shows what each record can change and the conservative question it creates.

Record type	Observable effect	PE triage use	Do not infer
Initial financing statement	Starts the indexed filing family and states debtor, secured party, and collateral indication	Establish identity, date, office, and claimed scope	Current balance, default, or priority
Amendment	May change parties, names, addresses, or collateral	Compare old and new terms; reopen entity-name and collateral review	That unchanged fields remain economically current
Assignment	Identifies an assignee in the filed amendment	Trace the named secured-party history	Loan sale terms or present beneficial ownership

Record type	Observable effect	PE triage use	Do not infer
Continuation	Extends effectiveness when timely and otherwise effective	Recalculate the next lapse date	That an obligation was renewed on the same economics
Termination	Ends effectiveness of the financing statement to which it relates	Mark that filing family for specialist review	That every debt, lien, or obligation involving the debtor is cleared
Lapse or stale indexed record	Indicates the statement ceased to be effective under the applicable rule, while the index may retain it	Separate current-looking from historical signals	That the historical transaction never mattered

The ordinary timing framework provides a consistency check. Subject to specified exceptions, a financing statement is effective for **five years**. A continuation may be filed only within the **six months** before expiration and generally adds another five-year period (law.cornell.edu). Upon lapse, the statement ceases to be effective (law.cornell.edu).

The index can nevertheless retain historical traces. Article 9 says a filing office may not remove a debtor's name until **one year after** effectiveness lapses as to all secured parties of record (law.cornell.edu). A stale result is therefore not automatically an error. It belongs in the chronology with its status and source date.

The table's termination row is deliberately narrow. An effective termination causes the related financing statement to cease being effective (law.cornell.edu). It does not, on the face of that rule, make a statement about unrelated filings or every underlying obligation.

PE Origination Triage and Escalation

The filing should influence **research priority**, not become a deal verdict. Broad collateral language may justify faster document collection. An equipment-specific statement may help explain a financing relationship relevant to capital intensity. A name mismatch may reveal an entity-resolution problem more important than the filing itself.

Table 3 is the core UCC-result interpretation matrix. Every example is a **Hypothetical Example** and uses fictional names.

Observed result	Conservative interpretation	Next origination action	Do not infer
No result for “Northstar Pump Works, LLC” (Hypothetical Example)	No match was returned for that exact query, office, scope, and time	Verify formation state, former names, variants, local exceptions, and portal status; consider a certified search	No debt, no liens, or a clean capital structure
“All assets” filing for “Redwood Process Systems, Inc.” (Hypothetical Example)	The filing uses broad collateral language	Retrieve the image and filing family; flag for financing-document review	Current balance, distress, default, priority, or enterprise value

Observed result	Conservative interpretation	Next origination action	Do not infer
Serial-numbered equipment filing for “Harborline Automation LLC” (Hypothetical Example)	The notice appears tied to described equipment	Match asset description, debtor identity, amendments, and dates	Ownership, remaining principal, or equipment condition
Lapsed statement still indexed for “Pioneer Filtration Corp.” (Hypothetical Example)	A historical filing remains visible after effectiveness ended	Preserve it in the chronology and check related filings	A current effective security interest from that record alone
Termination for one filing family of “Summit Valve Group, Inc.” (Hypothetical Example)	The related statement ceased to be effective	Confirm file number and whether other families remain	Every obligation or other filing was cleared
Similar name, different entity identifier (Hypothetical Example)	The hit may belong to another legal entity	Compare registry identifiers, addresses, formation state, and documents	That the target is the debtor
Central-office result plus county-level collateral clue (Hypothetical Example)	More than one filing office may be relevant	Search the local real-property index and escalate the office analysis	That the central search is complete

The matrix separates **fact, interpretation, and non-inference**. This is also the right model for target scoring. A filing may add a reviewer question or raise the evidence priority, but an opaque “lien risk” score hides the very distinctions the analyst needs to preserve.

Escalate when any of the following occurs:

- **Office uncertainty:** the debtor type, organization history, location, or collateral creates competing filing-office possibilities.
- **Name uncertainty:** registry evidence, portal logic, and filing names do not align.
- **Document gap:** the index shows a record, but the underlying image or related amendments are unavailable.
- **Status conflict:** search results, document images, and later records appear inconsistent.
- **Material collateral breadth:** broad language may affect diligence planning, though not valuation by itself.
- **Certified evidence need:** the team is moving beyond early triage and requires an official search product.
- **Priority or enforceability question:** the task has crossed from public-record research into legal analysis.

Evidence Capture and Reproducible Worksheet

A UCC search is reproducible only if another reviewer can rerun it. The **minimum worksheet** should contain:

- **Target record:** internal target ID, website, and analyst.

- **Entity evidence:** jurisdiction, exact legal name, entity identifier, and registry source.
- **Name version:** current name, former name, predecessor, successor, or supplementary variant.
- **Search configuration:** official portal, filing office, exact query, scope, filters, and search type.
- **Collection context:** UTC timestamp, portal update statement if available, and access restrictions.
- **Result identity:** filing number, initial or related record, debtor, secured party, and addresses.
- **Lifecycle fields:** filing date, amendment date, continuation date, termination date, and displayed status.
- **Collateral evidence:** verbatim collateral text plus the source document image.
- **Retention:** source URL, downloaded copy or screenshot, and document checksum if the workflow supports one.
- **Reviewer question:** the exact uncertainty, owner, escalation route, and disposition.

California certified responses identify the date and time through which the search is effective (sos.ca.gov). Illinois says its database updates as filings are indexed (apps.ilsos.gov). These details show why **collection time and source scope** belong in the record.

Certified products are separate workflow choices. Delaware states that searches performed by its authorized searchers are certified UCC searches (corp.delaware.gov). Illinois requires a UCC-11 information request for a certified search with images (apps.ilsos.gov). Early portal review and a certified search therefore are not interchangeable deliverables.

Docket's documented Audit stage reviews collected evidence separately and leaves unresolved questions visible (docket.capital). Applied to UCC research, that means a second reviewer should confirm that the quoted collateral, record type, dates, and conclusion agree. Unsupported conclusions should be removed while the filing observation and open question remain.

State and Territory Filing-Office Directory

The maintained directory should begin with NASS, whose official page directs users to the state or territory of interest (nass.org). The Uniform Law Commission independently describes a state filing-office system (uniformlaws.org). As of **September 22, 2026**, use this compact coverage checklist to ensure that no U.S. jurisdiction is silently omitted:

- **A through D:** Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia.
- **Florida through Iowa:** Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa.
- **K through M:** Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana.
- **N:** Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota.

- **O through P:** Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania.
- **R through S:** Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota.
- **T through W:** Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.
- **Territories and associated jurisdictions shown by the directory:** American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands.

The checklist is not a claim that one office or one search covers every record. For each jurisdiction, a maintained operational directory should store the official URL, central or local office scope, searchable fields, status coverage, image availability, certification route, fee, login requirement, last checked date, and owner. Refresh it at least quarterly and after any failed link or interface change.

Several current official examples show the variation. Texas permits searches by filing number, debtor, or secured party and lists **$1 per search** (sos.state.tx.us) (sos.state.tx.us). Florida directs users to its secured-transaction registry for searches, copies, and certification requests (dos.fl.gov). Illinois says its online index includes both UCC and federal tax lien filings (apps.ilsos.gov).

New York shows why status scope matters: when the request does not specify filing status, it is processed for **unlapsed filings only** (dos.ny.gov). A no-result conclusion that omits that scope is incomplete.

Data Analysis and Evidence

The strongest quantitative evidence here concerns **timing, fees, and administrative volume**, not credit outcomes. The law supplies a five-year ordinary duration, a six-month continuation window, and a one-year minimum period before an index may remove a debtor's name after lapse. Together, those intervals explain why a single search date can expose active-looking, continuation-sensitive, and historical records at once.

Official fee examples also demonstrate why directory maintenance matters. Texas lists **$1 per online search** and **$15 per certificate** (sos.state.tx.us). New York lists **$25 for a UCC search** and requires a separate UCC-11 for each name searched (dos.ny.gov). Delaware's published certified-copy schedule includes a **$25 certification fee plus $10 for the first page** (corp.delaware.gov). These are different products and cannot be compared as if each price purchased identical coverage.

Delaware reported **295,832 searches in 2023**, **336,300 in 2024**, and **406,080 in 2025** (corp.delaware.gov). That is an increase of **110,248**, or approximately **37.3%**, from 2023 to 2025, calculated from the official counts. The series establishes meaningful administrative volume in one major filing jurisdiction. It does not establish PE usage, borrower risk, search accuracy, or a national market size.

Search volume should not be mistaken for freshness. The Internal Revenue Service warns, in its internal guidance about a national UCC locator, that information may be **weeks or months old** and is not an adequate substitute for the official governmental recordkeeper (irs.gov). For an acquisition workflow, this supports a clear hierarchy: aggregator for discovery, official portal for confirmation, certified product when the diligence stage requires it, and counsel for legal interpretation.

Implications and Future Directions

For origination teams, a UCC workflow is most valuable as an **entity-resolution and escalation system**. It can expose legal-name problems, historical financing relationships, broad collateral language, equipment-specific records, and gaps in a target file. It is least reliable when compressed into a binary “has lien” field.

Three operating changes follow:

- **Separate observation from interpretation.** Store the filing fact, analyst reading, unsupported inferences, and counsel question in different fields.
- **Version the search.** Preserve names, jurisdictions, portal configuration, collection time, documents, and later corrections.
- **Use stage-appropriate evidence.** Early triage may use an official portal result; confirmatory diligence may require a certified search and specialist analysis.
- **Maintain jurisdiction metadata.** Recheck links, fees, login requirements, searchable fields, and status scope at least quarterly.
- **Keep other lien systems visible.** A UCC search is one part of public-record diligence, not a universal lien search.

Automation can help normalize fields and link record families, but it should not erase conflicting evidence. Delaware, for example, says a full or partial secured-party assignment appears on its search listing as **“Added”** (corp.delaware.gov). A parser should preserve that jurisdiction-specific label and the underlying image instead of translating it silently into an economic conclusion.

Future improvement should focus on measurable quality controls: percentage of targets with confirmed formation evidence, percentage of searches covering every documented former name, proportion of hits with complete filing families, reviewer disagreement rate, certified-search escalation rate, and age of the state-directory check. Those measures evaluate the research process without pretending that public notices predict deal outcomes.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

What does a UCC lien search show?

It can show indexed financing statements and related records associated with the searched debtor name, subject to the chosen office, query, status scope, and portal coverage. Common fields include debtor, secured party, file number, dates, collateral indication, and record type. It does not automatically show current balance, default, priority, or every possible lien.

What does a UCC filing prove?

It proves that the filing office accepted and indexed a public notice with particular contents at a recorded time. Delaware, for example, requires filings submitted directly to its Division to be electronic (corp.delaware.gov). The filing alone does not prove a current balance, default, collateral value, or legal priority.

How should a PE analyst search UCC filings?

Confirm debtor type and jurisdiction of organization, collect the exact current legal name and documented former names, choose the appropriate official filing office, run and log each exact query, retrieve the full filing family and images, then record explicit non-inferences and reviewer questions. Use the NASS directory for state and territory routing, but verify the current official portal and its scope.

What are the main UCC lien search limitations?

The main **UCC lien search limitations** are jurisdiction risk, exact-name and variant behavior, incomplete status scope, missing images, local-office exceptions, indexing lag, and separation from other lien systems. The public-notice function is the starting point, not a live credit ledger (nass.org).

How to search UCC filings for an acquisition target?

For a **UCC financing statement acquisition target** review, first resolve the legal entity, then choose the office, build the name set, run exact queries, collect the filing family, and separate the observation from any inference. These **UCC lien signals for private equity** should change evidence priority or trigger follow-up, not become automatic exclusion rules.

Why can a no-result search be misleading?

The query may use the wrong legal name, office, variant, status filter, or collateral-recording system. California explicitly says debtor-search results do not reflect name variants (sos.ca.gov). New York may process an unspecified status request for unlapsed filings only. A no-result statement must therefore name its query and scope.

When should the team order a certified search?

Escalate when the transaction moves beyond early screening, when the portal cannot supply images or adequate status coverage, when results conflict, or when counsel requires an official product. Certified-search routes differ by state, so record the product, effective time, name searched, and included images rather than merely marking “certified.”

Florida's official page, for example, routes users to a registry for filings, searches, copies, and certification requests (dos.fl.gov).

Does a termination mean the borrower has no debt?

No such inference follows from the filing alone. Article 9 states that the financing statement to which an effective termination relates ceases to be effective. The analyst should verify the file number, other filing families, other lien systems, and underlying documents before drawing a broader conclusion.

Conclusion

A UCC lien search is useful to private equity when it is treated as **structured public-record evidence**. The result can document an indexed notice, named parties, dates, collateral language, and a lifecycle of amendments, assignments, continuations, lapse, or termination. It cannot by itself establish current debt, default, priority, collateral value, or a clean capital structure.

NASS describes the filing's public-notice role (nass.org), while the IRS identifies the Notice of Federal Tax Lien as a separate public document (irs.gov). Together, those official descriptions reinforce why “UCC search” should never be treated as synonymous with “all liens.”

The defensible workflow begins with debtor classification and formation evidence, selects the office under the applicable location and collateral rules, searches the exact legal name plus documented historical names, and preserves each query. The analyst then assembles the filing family, quotes the collateral, records the portal's status and effective time, and separates the observable fact from interpretation and non-inference.

For early target triage, the proper outputs are **relevant**, **not relevant on current evidence**, or **unresolved and escalated**. Broad collateral language, a name mismatch, a local filing clue, or an incomplete document family can change research priority without becoming an adverse verdict. As diligence advances, certified searches and qualified counsel replace informal portal review. That measured handoff is the central discipline: use UCC records to ask better questions, while preserving exactly what the public record does and does not prove.

Source links

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

1. https://www.nass.org/business-services/ucc-filings
2. https://dos.ny.gov/ucc-frequently-asked-questions
3. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-307
4. https://delcode.delaware.gov/title6/c009/sc05/
5. https://www.sos.ca.gov/administration/regulations/current-regulations/business/uniform-commercial-code
6. https://docket.capital/articles/pe-target-record-entity-identifiers
7. https://www.uniformlaws.org/acts/ucc
8. https://docket.capital/
9. https://corp.delaware.gov/ucc/
10. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-502
11. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-504
12. https://www.irs.gov/businesses/small-businesses-self-employed/whats-the-difference-between-a-levy-and-a-lien
13. https://docket.capital/articles/business-registry-verification-matrix
14. https://www.sos.ca.gov/business-programs/ucc/ra9-filing-information
15. https://bpd.cdn.sos.ca.gov/be/forms/notice-of-change-certificates-of-filing.pdf
16. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-512
17. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-514
18. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-515
19. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-519
20. https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/9/9-513

21. https://apps.ilsos.gov/uccsearch/
22. https://docket.capital/articles/acquisition-target-research-freshness
23. https://corp.delaware.gov/uccsearch/
24. https://www.sos.state.tx.us/ucc/ucc-filing-instructions.shtml
25. https://dos.fl.gov/sunbiz/other-services/ucc-information
26. https://dos.ny.gov/uniform-commercial-code-rules
27. https://corp.delaware.gov/uccfeesSept09/
28. https://corp.delaware.gov/stats/
29. https://www.irs.gov/irm/part5/irm_05-001-018r

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