

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case No. 18R 0316

Decision and Order Reversing
County Board of Equalization

Case No. 19R 0514

Decision and Order Affirming
County Board of Equalization

Background

1. The Subject Property is a residential parcel, with a legal description of: Lot 210, Kenwood Addition, Omaha, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$32,100 for tax year 2018 and \$25,400 for tax year 2019.
3. Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC (the Taxpayer) protested these values to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested assessed values of \$23,400 for tax year 2018 and \$17,000 for tax year 2019.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$32,100 for tax year 2018 and \$25,400 for tax year 2019.
5. The Taxpayer appealed the determinations of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on August 12, 2020, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Sixth Floor, Nebraska State Office Building, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
7. Arielle Bloemer, legal counsel, and Scott W. Bloemer, Member, were present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Kurt Skradis (the Appraiser), was present at the hearing 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 a determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.²

¹ 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

16. The Taxpayer and the Appraiser agreed that the actual value of the Subject Property for tax year 2018 was \$25,400.
17. The Taxpayer stated the 2019 valuation was still too high because the Subject Property still needed many repairs. Per the Property Evaluation Report done by Connie Watson in June 2020, \$24,100 in repairs were needed. The Taxpayer stated the repairs reported on the 2020 report were needed in 2019.
18. The Taxpayer provided five comparable properties that are nearby but not in the same neighborhood as the Subject Property. Four of the comparables are more than 20 years older than the Subject Property. The comparable that was close in age was in a different neighborhood and was built on a slab whereas the Subject Property has a basement. The comparable also lacked other components that were present in the Subject Property.
19. The Appraiser stated that sales in the Subject Property’s neighborhood support the current valuation. The Appraiser stated the current rating of “fair” for the Subject Property accounts for the deficiencies found in the Property Evaluation Report.

³ *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 283, 753 N.W.2d 802, 811 (2008).

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. County 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).

20. 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 for the 2018 tax year.
21. 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 for the 2019 tax year.
22. 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 for the 2018 tax year.
23. 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 for the 2019 tax year.

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 2018 is vacated and reversed.
2. The Decision of the County Board of Equalization determining the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2019 is affirmed.
3. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2018 and 2019 is: **\$25,400.**
4. 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).
5. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this Decision and Order is denied.
6. Each Party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
7. This Decision and Order shall only be applicable to tax years 2018 and 2019.
8. This Decision and Order is effective on August 17, 2021.

Signed and Sealed: August 17, 2021

James D. Kuhn, Commissioner