

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

Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC,  
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,  
Appellee.

Case No: 17R 0557

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 1,048 square foot raised ranch residence, with a legal description of: Homestead Add Lot 888 Block 0 S ½ Lot 886 & All Lots 887 & 888 100 X 133, Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$91,800 for tax year 2017.
3. Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC, (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$72,400 for tax year 2017.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$82,000 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 27, 2018, at Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room E, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Scott W. Bloemer 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> See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1301(1) (Reissue 2018).

<sup>2</sup> 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.”<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 alleges that the increases in assessed value from prior years was excessive.
17. The assessed value for real property may be different from year to year, dependent upon the circumstances.<sup>9</sup> For this reason, a prior year’s assessment is not relevant to the subsequent year’s valuation.<sup>10</sup>
18. The Taxpayer alleged that the per square foot assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with a comparable property.
19. The Taxpayer notes that the Nebraska Court of Appeals held in *Scribante* that “To set the valuation of similarly situated property, i.e. comparables, at materially different levels, i.e., value per square foot, is by definition, unreasonable and arbitrary, under the Nebraska Constitution.”<sup>11</sup>

---

<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).

<sup>9</sup> See, *Affiliated Foods Coop. v. Madison Co. Bd. Of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 613, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988).

<sup>10</sup> See, *DeVore v. Bd. Of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 13 N.W.2d 451 (1944), *Affiliated Foods*, 229 Neb. at 613, 428 N.W.2d at 206 (1988)

<sup>11</sup> *Scribante v. Douglas County Board of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 25, 39, 588 N.W.2d 190, 199 (1999).

20. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.<sup>12</sup>
21. The Taxpayer presented the Property Record File (PRF) of properties located near the Subject Property.
22. Along with the PRFs the Taxpayer offered a chart that made adjustments to the assessed values of the comparable properties to adjust for differences in the characteristics of the properties; these adjustments were recalculated at the hearing before the Commission. The Taxpayer stated that these adjustments were based on the Taxpayer's experience in the real estate market and the information contained in the PRFs.
23. The County Board presented information regarding all of 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 those areas, including the Subject Property, to support the differences in per square foot assessed values between the Subject Property and the other properties presented.
24. The Commission finds that one of the properties presented by the Taxpayer for equalization purposes was rated as low quality and the remaining properties were rated as fair quality; therefore these properties are not comparable to the Subject Property, which is rated average quality.
25. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the valuations of similarly situated properties were set at materially different levels entitling the Subject Property to a reduction in assessed values under the court's determination in *Scribante*.
26. 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.
27. 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	\$12,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$70,000</u>
Total	\$82,000

---

<sup>12</sup> See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, Property Assessment Valuation, at 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010).

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 January 17, 2020.

Signed and Sealed: January 17, 2020

---

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner