

**BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION**

Lee E. Ellingson,  
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,  
Appellee.

Case No: 17R 0512

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

Background

1. The Subject Property is a residential property improved with a 2,681 square foot ranch style residence, with a legal description of: Bay Wood Lot 78 Block 0 Irreg., Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$614,800 for tax year 2017.
3. Lee E. Ellingson (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$570,000 for tax year 2017.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$614,800 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 August 22, 2019, at Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room 227, Omaha, NE before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Jason Rich was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
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.<sup>1</sup>
10. The Commission’s review of the determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1301(1) (Reissue 2018).

<sup>2</sup> 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.”<sup>3</sup> 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.”<sup>4</sup>
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.<sup>5</sup>
13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>6</sup>
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.<sup>7</sup>
15. The Commission’s Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.<sup>8</sup>

#### Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

16. The Taxpayer alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property was greater than its actual value and that the assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with other comparable properties.
17. The Taxpayer presented the Real Estate Transfer Statement, which shows that the Subject Property was purchased for \$570,000 in October 2016.
18. The Taxpayer presented information regarding the features and amenities of the Subject Property and three other properties located in the same subdivision as the Subject Property as well as their assessment histories.
19. The County Board presented the Property Record File (PRF) for the Subject Property as well as a spreadsheet of 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

---

<sup>3</sup> *Brenner* at 283, 811.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

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

<sup>7</sup> 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).

<sup>8</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

properties presented. The sale of the Subject Property was included in the County Boards list of qualified sales.

20. The County Appraiser indicated that after reviewing all of the information presented at the hearing regarding the Subject Property and other properties in the subdivision, including the PRF and the sales in the economic area of the Subject Property, his opinion of value for the Subject Property would be \$570,000 for tax year 2017.
21. The Commission finds and determines, based on the information before it in the present proceeding, that the assessed value of the Subject Property for tax year 2017 is \$570,000.
22. The Taxpayer has produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
23. The Taxpayer has 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 vacated.

## 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 vacated and reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2017 is: \$570,000.
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.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on October 7, 2020.

Signed and Sealed: October 7, 2020

---

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner