

**Topic:** Multiple Authorizing Secured Parties

**Question By:** Paula Kelsey

**Jurisdiction:** Alaska

**Date:** September 20, 2013 and August 25, 2014 (similar question from California)

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	California does not index this information either, but a customer who wants to include all the authorizing parties called to ask how to fill out the form.
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	Idaho does not index field 9. Field 9 is simply part of the scanned document image. With our online application the filer must choose one debtor or secured party as the authorizing party. If the filer has more than one authorizing party they must submit the filing on paper.
Illinois	Illinois has run into this challenge in recent months:  Since box #9 was too small they were placing additional authoring parties on a UCC AP as secured parties without address. We rejected the filing due to no address, and asked that they place as much as they can in box 9 and attach a document naming the additional names as authoring secured parties.  So far our solution is working...
Indiana	Indiana is the same as OH.
Iowa	
Kansas	Kansas does not index the authorizing party.
Kentucky	
Louisiana	Louisiana is the same as Ohio.

<b>Maine</b>	
<b>Maryland</b>	
<b>Massachusetts</b>	
<b>Michigan</b>	
<b>Minnesota</b>	Minnesota does not index item 9 for paper filings. In our current online application, the filer can check a box to indicate they “wish <u>not</u> to enter an authorizing party” or select either an “individual” or “organization” name if they wish to enter an authorizing party, and they can only enter one name. If the filer had more than one authorizing party, they would need to submit the filing on paper.
<b>Mississippi</b>	
<b>Missouri</b>	
<b>Montana</b>	
<b>Nebraska</b>	This has not come up in our office. We barely ever see anything in box 9. If additional parties are placed in box 14, it would not change the filing as we do not index either items in box 9 or 14 in Nebraska.
<b>Nevada</b>	Nevada is the same as Ohio.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	
<b>New Jersey</b>	
<b>New Mexico</b>	
<b>New York</b>	
<b>North Carolina</b>	
<b>North Dakota</b>	
<b>Ohio</b>	Ohio does not index Field 9 on the UCC3. In fact, if it was not completed on a paper filing, Ohio would not reject it. It is not a required field on the UCC3 online, either. I suspect if an online filer wanted to enter more than one party for the authorizing party, they would have to do it in the miscellaneous info data box.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Like Minnesota, Oklahoma does not index item 9 for paper filings.
<b>Oregon</b>	
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	
<b>Rhode Island</b>	
<b>South Carolina</b>	
<b>South Dakota</b>	
<b>Tennessee</b>	
<b>Texas</b>	Texas (and hopefully all other jurisdictions) does not index data in field 9. To find out who the authorizing party is on a UCC3 one would have to view the image which is available online.
<b>Utah</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	
<b>Virginia</b>	
<b>Washington</b>	
<b>West Virginia</b>	

<b>Wisconsin</b>	WI does not index field 9 and so would also not look to field 14 for information. Our online application captures field 9 information but the additional authorizing party would be entered under an optional field and would be the responsibility of the person filing the information. We have no edits or prompts in place to ensure that if there are multiple authorizing parties, that all are entered.
<b>Wyoming</b>	

**Additional Comments:**

**Full Text of Original Email:**

The instructions on the UCC-3 regarding field 9, Name of Secured Party of Record states that if there is more than one authorizing Secured Party or Debtor, enter additional names(s) in item 14 of Amendment Addendum (Form UCC3Ad). However, field on UCC3Ad is for Additional Space for Item 8 (Collateral). This is a non-searchable field, so if the submitter enters SP or Debtor info here, it would have to be manually entered by our staff. In addition, how would we handle additional collateral AND multiple SP's?

How are your jurisdictions handling this issue? How are your programmers setting up your online filing for this issue? Is the instruction page for the UCC-3 incorrect?

Thank you for any assistance you can throw my way.

**Second question from 8/21/2014 (Kathleen Vasquez, California):** I have a customer who has asked how to fill out the UCC3 and UCC3Ad when there are multiple authorizing parties. The instructions for box 9 indicate that additional authorizing parties should be entered on the Addendum in box 14; however, box 14 and the the instructions for box 14 only speak to collateral.

Has this come up in any of our offices?