

Topic: New Form Acceptance

Question By: Randy Moes

Jurisdiction: Texas

Date: September 5, 2013

Jurisdiction	Question(s)
Alabama	
Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
Colorado	
Connecticut	
Delaware	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Georgia	
Hawaii	
Idaho	
Illinois	<p>Illinois is receiving the same.</p> <p>We had a variation blend of the old form and the new form come to the office yesterday. The form indicates that it is the National form with a 4/20/2011 revision, but it was missing the text above #1 and #2 that the new form has, and the character fields were not in line with the actual National form.</p> <p>This causes a problem for any office that may use Optical Character Recognition (OCR).</p>
Indiana	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Louisiana	
Maine	
Maryland	
Massachusetts	

<p>Michigan</p>	<p>Michigan UCC is rejecting UCC1 and UCC3 filing forms that are not in the approved format according to statute:</p> <p>MCL 440.9521. Amended form and format of written initial financing statement and amendment.</p> <p>Sec. 9521. (1) Except for a reason set forth in section 9516(2) or 9520(5), a filing office that accepts written records for filing shall not refuse to accept a written initial financing statement that conforms to the form and format of the UCC financing statement (Form UCC1)(rev. 04/20/11) or the UCC financing statement addendum (Form UCC1Ad)(rev. 04/20/11), promulgated by the American law institute and the uniform law commission, or to the form and format of any other revision to or version of either of those forms that are promulgated by the American law institute and the uniform law commission and adopted by the secretary of state.</p> <p>(2) Except for a reason set forth in section 9516(2) or 9520(5), a filing office that accepts written records for filing shall not refuse to accept a written financing statement amendment that conforms to the form and format of the UCC financing statement amendment (Form UCC3)(rev. 04/20/11) or the UCC financing statement amendment addendum (Form UCC3Ad)(rev. 04/20/11), promulgated by the American law institute and the uniform law commission, or to the form and format of any other revision to or version of either of those forms that are promulgated by the American law institute and the uniform law commission and adopted by the secretary of state.</p>
<p>Minnesota</p>	
<p>Mississippi</p>	
<p>Missouri</p>	

Montana	
Nebraska	
Nevada	
New Hampshire	
New Jersey	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
North Dakota	
Ohio	As long as the data fields match the IACA model form and numbering and labels are not changed, Ohio will accept a form that has something different in the footer. This is assuming it is on the current model form, and not an old version of the form.
Oklahoma	
Oregon	<p>I don't think there's anything magic about who creates the form. How can I tell if this is off the website or someone re-created it? As long as it has the info we need and is in a format that works for us (sometimes we have bar code issues), I don't see why we can't accept it.</p> <p>Our law says we must accept the official versions; it doesn't say we can't accept others. In fact, Oregon has slightly changed the standard because our law isn't quite uniform. So we already accept "non-standard" forms. Our electronic format is designed not to follow paper forms. And anyway, aren't our paper forms just created to make sure people are giving us the right information in a format we can easily process? In business registry, we deal with nonstandard documents all the time.</p>
Pennsylvania	
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	
South Dakota	
Tennessee	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

Additional Comments:

Comment from Randy Moes (Texas): The problem we are experiencing is that some forms are very close, however upon close inspection we find that the wording is changed or the numbering is changed.

Do we still accept these? We have everything we need to index and clarity is good.

Also, if someone just recreates the form on their own and puts IACA and the revision date at the bottom of the form, is that okay? They are passing it off as the IACA approved form, but it has not gone through the review that the IACA form went through. Like I say, we do find typos. Does this matter, if the fields we need for indexing purposed are on the form, and the form is pretty close to accurate? Is pretty close okay?

I for sure do not want to have to scrutinize each form for accuracy. With the volume we handle I cannot have my folks look at every character of every line.

Full Text of Original Email:

How strict is everyone being on the New Forms.

We are getting a lot of forms where people are simply trying to recreate the IACA form and putting "International Association of Commercial Administrators" on the bottom of the form along with the 4/20/2011 revision date.

Some are close, some are not so close.

Just hoping to prevent a situation where we accept some but not others.