



110 Horizon Drive, Suite 210, Raleigh, NC 27615
919.459.2081

Update:
Real Estate Document Formatting

**Adopted by the PRIA Board on January 13,
2016**

(Originally Published: March 2, 2000)

<http://www.pria.us>

PRIA Copyright Notice, Disclaimer and Evaluation License

Version 1.0 April 2004 (the "PRIA Evaluation License" or the "Evaluation License")

Copyright © 2016 - writers listed in the Incomplete Work (collectively or individually, a "Licensor"). All rights reserved.

This draft document (the "Incomplete Work") is made available by the Property Records Industry Association ("PRIA") to Members and select members of the general public for review, evaluation and comment only, as it is not a final version of the document under development. At the time such document is finalized, it shall be published in accordance with, inter alia, PRIA Copyright Notice, Disclaimer and End-User License Version 1.1 November 2003, or any successor license.

Subject to this License, Licensor hereby grants any user of the Incomplete Work ("Licensee") a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive license to reproduce the Incomplete Work in copies, and to use the Incomplete Work and all such reproductions solely for purposes of reviewing, evaluating and commenting upon the Incomplete Work. NO OTHER RIGHTS ARE GRANTED UNDER THIS LICENSE AND ALL OTHER RIGHTS ARE EXPRESSLY RESERVED TO LICENSOR. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Licensor does not grant any right to (i) prepare proprietary derivative works based upon the Incomplete Work, (ii) distribute copies of the Incomplete Work to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership, or (iii) display the Incomplete Work publicly. Comments on the Incomplete Work must be sent to PRIA as indicated at www.pria.us.

Any reproduction of the Incomplete Work shall reproduce verbatim the above copyright notice, the entire text of this Evaluation License and the entire disclaimer below under the following header:

This document includes Incomplete Works developed by PRIA and some of its contributors, subject to PRIA Evaluation License, Version 1.0 April 2004 published at www.pria.us/license.htm or any subsequent applicable version of such License. "PRIA" is a trade name of the "Property Records Industry Association." No reference to PRIA or any of its trademarks by Licensee shall imply endorsement of Licensee's activities and products.

DISCLAIMER: THIS INCOMPLETE WORK IS PROVIDED "AS IS." PRIA, THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER, THE AUTHORS OF THIS INCOMPLETE WORK AND ANY STANDARD -SETTING BODY CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS INCOMPLETE WORK MAKE NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES (i) EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, TITLE OR NON-INFRINGEMENT; (ii) THAT THE CONTENTS OF SUCH INCOMPLETE WORK ARE FREE FROM ERROR OR SUITABLE FOR ANY PURPOSE; NOR THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF SUCH CONTENTS WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY THIRD-PARTY PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS, TRADEMARKS OR OTHER RIGHTS. IN NO EVENT WILL PRIA, THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER, ANY AUTHOR OF THIS INCOMPLETE WORK, OR THE STANDARD-SETTING BODY CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS INCOMPLETE WORK BE LIABLE TO ANY PARTY FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, SPECIAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES FOR ANY USE OF THIS INCOMPLETE WORK, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, ANY LOST PROFITS, BUSINESS INTERRUPTION, LOSS OF PROGRAMS OR OTHER DATA ON YOUR INFORMATION HANDLING SYSTEM OR OTHERWISE, EVEN IF PRIA, THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER AND/OR ANY AUTHORS AND/OR ANY STANDARD-SETTING

BODY CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS INCOMPLETE WORK ARE EXPRESSLY ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

Introduction

In 2000 a white paper was published by the Property Records Industry Joint Task Force, which was a predecessor of the Property Records Industry Association (PRIA). It was called “Real Estate Document Formatting,” and was based on an extensive survey of then-current requirements in recording offices nationwide. In keeping with its purpose to promote consistency in real estate recordable document formatting standards, it addressed every issue associated with those standards. It made recommendations concerning the standardization of those rules by recorders across the country. It did not address issues associated with eRecording, which was in its infancy in 2000.

The paper was reviewed in 2015 by PRIA’s Business Processes and Procedures Committee. The Committee has found that the information and recommendations presented in the paper are as valid today as they were in 2000. The huge improvements in the technology available both to document submitters and to recorders resolved many of the formatting issues that formerly bedeviled the industry. Further, the Committee has been unable to identify any document formatting issues that are uniquely associated with eRecorded documents. Based on this evaluation, the Committee determined that no broad update of the paper is warranted.

The recommendations set forth in the paper address only recordable real estate documents, such as deeds, mortgages or deeds of trust, assignments, releases and satisfactions. They do not address other documents, such as military notices, tax liens or court documents. The recommendations are based on two overriding principles: the Legibility Principle, which requires that recorded documents are sufficiently legible so that reproductions will also be legible; and the Accessibility Principle, which ensures that documents accepted for recording contain sufficient information to produce an accurate and efficient index.

Legibility

The legibility recommendations for paper documents include the following:

Paper weight	20 lb.
Paper size	8½ x 11 preferred; 8½ x 14 accepted
Paper color	White; no water marks
Staples or binding	None
One or two side print	One side only
Impression seals	None allowed
Colored highlight markers	None allowed

Margins	Top 3" of first page recommended for Recorder use, especially on right side of page (not recommended on last page); All other margins, 1"
Ink color	Black preferred, with dark blue signatures
Font	10-point Times New Roman, or equivalent
Spacing	9 lines per inch maximum

Accessibility

The accessibility recommendations for paper documents include the following:

- Document title
- Grantor and Grantee names and addresses
- Legal description
- "Return to" instruction
- References to other, related document(s)
- Parcel identification number
- Preparer information

Some document formatting standards relate even more directly to the issue of indexing. For example, some jurisdictions (notably the Commonwealth of Virginia, VA Code Ann. § 17.1-223) rely on rules that require the submitters to highlight in some fashion (such as underlining, **bolding**, or ALL CAPS) specific data fields in the document that will be used to create an index of the recorded document. Such requirements are criticized as an attempt to transfer to the submitter, at least in part, the responsibility for the indexing function that has traditionally been exclusively the recorder's responsibility. Today, 15 years after the white paper was first published, there is scarcely less controversy about this issue than at the time of its publication.

Non-Compliance

One of the most interesting discussions in the 2000 white paper was regarding the consequences of a submitter's non-compliance with formatting standards. One purpose of any formatting standard for recordable documents should be to deter the submission of non-conforming documents. Thus standards should help minimize the issues those documents raise in terms of both legibility and accessibility.

The traditional deterrence method has been the rejection of the document by the recorder, which has the virtue of keeping non-compliant documents from entering the public record. However, it is also true that a failure to include within the reject notice the exact requirements the document failed to satisfy will not promote the correction of formatting

errors. Rather, the recorder must be careful to publish precise standards and to refer in any reject notice to the exact ones that were violated.

An alternative method of deterrence has been the imposition of a financial penalty for the submission of non-conforming documents. One potential problem with this approach is that a relative small penalty will not, actually, deter non-conforming filings. Rather, submitters have been accused of simply submitting documents they know are non-compliant together with a check for the extra fee. Also, even if a relatively large penalty is imposed, the payment of that penalty does not increase either the legibility or accessibility of the public record.

The white paper suggested a mixed approach to this problem, perhaps starting with a precise rejection notice and then moving ahead with a substantial penalty if the second submission is still non-compliant. It should be noted that, inasmuch as some 15 years have elapsed since non-conforming penalty fees were imposed, now would certainly be a time when straightforward rejection for non-compliance with legibility and accessibility standards is a logical outcome.