

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Wesley D. Asche,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case No: 17R 0292

Decision and Order Affirming the
Determination of the Douglas
County Board of Equalization

Background

1. The Subject Property is a residential parcel improved with a 1,214 square foot one and one-half story residence, with a legal description of: Seymours Add Lot 16, Block 1, N 46 ft, 46 x 124, Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$40,900 for tax year 2017.
3. Wesley D. Asche (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$15,300 for tax year 2017.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$40,900 for tax year 2017.
5. The Taxpayer appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on September 9, 2019, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Wesley D. Asche was present at the hearing.
8. Larry Thomsen, Senior Appraiser: Residential, of the Douglas County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office (the County Appraiser) was present for the County Board.

Applicable Law

9. All real property in Nebraska subject to taxation shall be assessed as of the effective date of January 1.¹
10. The Commission’s review of the determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.²

¹ See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Reissue 2018).

² See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018), *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 286, 753 N.W.2d 802, 813 (2008). “When an appeal is conducted as a ‘trial de novo,’ as opposed to a ‘trial de novo on the record,’ it means literally a new hearing and not merely new findings of fact based upon a previous record. A trial de novo is conducted as though the earlier trial had not been held in the first place, and evidence is taken anew as such evidence is available at the time of the trial on appeal.” *Koch v. Cedar Cty. Freeholder Bd.*, 276 Neb. 1009, 1019 (2009).

11. When considering an appeal a presumption exists that the “board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action.”³ That presumption “remains until there is competent evidence to the contrary presented, and the presumption disappears when there is competent evidence adduced on appeal to the contrary. From that point forward, the reasonableness of the valuation fixed by the board of equalization becomes one of fact based upon all the evidence presented. The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.”⁴
12. The order, decision, determination or action appealed from shall be affirmed unless evidence is adduced establishing that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary.⁵
13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁶
14. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.⁷
15. The Commission’s Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.⁸

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

1. The Taxpayer alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property should be reduced because its quality and characteristics limited potential purchasers and renters.
2. The Taxpayer offered no information to quantify the impact of the alleged limitations on purchasers or renters on the value of the Subject Property.
3. The Taxpayer alleged that the Subject Property sold for \$20,000 less than the assessed value in 2018, and that the assessed value for the Subject Property should be reduced by that amount.
4. The County Board presented the Property Record File (PRF) for the Subject Property as well as information regarding the qualified sales that occurred in the economic area of the Subject Property used in determining the value attributed to each of the characteristics of residential properties in the area, including the Subject Property, to support the per square foot assessed values of the Subject Property and the other properties presented.
5. “It is true that the purchase price of property may be taken into consideration in determining the actual value thereof for assessment purposes, together with all other

³ *Brenner* at 283, 811.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

⁶ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

⁷ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo Cty.*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. Cty. Bd. of Equal. of York Cty.*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

relevant elements pertaining to such issue; however, standing alone, it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes. Other matters relevant to the actual value thereof must be considered in connection with the sale price to determine actual value. Sale price is not synonymous with actual value or fair market value.”⁹ “Pursuant to § 77-112, the statutory measure of actual value is not what an individual buyer may be willing to pay for property, but, rather, its market value in the ordinary course of trade.”¹⁰

6. The Taxpayer did not present a Real Estate Transfer Statement or other evidence to demonstrate the circumstances of the sale of the Subject Property to allow the Commission to determine if the sale was an arm’s length sale, or even the actual sales price.
7. The Taxpayer has not produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
8. The Taxpayer has not adduced clear and convincing evidence that the determination of the County Board is arbitrary or unreasonable and the decision of the County Board should be affirmed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Decision of the County Board of Equalization determining the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2017 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2017 is:

Land	\$ 700
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$40,200</u>
Total	\$40,900

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018 (Reissue 2018).
4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this Decision and Order is denied.
5. Each Party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
6. This Decision and Order shall only be applicable to tax year 2017.

⁹ *Forney v. Box Butte County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 417, 424, 582 N.W.2d 631, 637, (1998).

¹⁰ *Cabela’s, Inc. v. Cheyenne County Board of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 593, 597 N.W.2d 623, 632 (1999) (citations omitted).

7. This Decision and Order is effective on December 2, 2020.

Signed and Sealed: December 2, 2020

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner