

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case Nos: 18R 0344 & 19R 0488

Decision and Order Reversing
County Board of Equalization

Background

1. The Subject Property is a residential parcel with a legal description of: Benson Lot 4, Block 12, Lots 3 & 4 100 x 128.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$73,500 for tax year 2018 and \$73,500 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 \$62,500 for tax year 2018 and \$62,500 for tax year 2019.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$73,500 for tax year 2018 and \$73,500 for tax year 2019.
5. Bel Fury Investments Group, LLC appealed the determinations of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on July 21, 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
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

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).

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 stated his major issue with the 2018 and 2019 valuation was the land component. The Taxpayer stated the land value increased \$13,800 over the 2017 land valuation. The Taxpayer provided four comparable properties that have lower land values than the Subject Property. The Taxpayer found the per square foot land value of the comparables was .95 whereas the per square foot land value of the Subject Property is \$1.63 per square foot.
17. The Taxpayer stated the Subject Property is being valued with a minimal finished basement. The Taxpayer asserted there is no basement finish of any type in the Subject Property.
18. The Appraiser stated the Taxpayer’s comparable properties are in a different neighborhood and are being assessed with a different valuation model. They have different neighborhood and quality adjustments than the Subject Property and would not be comparable.
19. The Appraiser agreed that the minimal finish value should be taken off the 2018 and 2019 valuations. The Appraiser estimated the value would be lowered by about \$700.

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 Commission found the value of the minimal basement finish is \$1,444 and the depreciation is 60.61% which would be a value of \$570 (rounded) for the minimal basement finish. \$52,700 (improvement value) minus \$570 = \$52,130 (rounded).
21. 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.
22. The Taxpayer has adduced clear and convincing evidence that the determinations of the County Board are arbitrary or unreasonable and the decisions of the County Board should be vacated.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Decisions of the County Board of Equalization determining the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2018 and 2019 are vacated and reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2018 and 2019 is: **\$72,930**.
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 years 2018 and 2019.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on May 28, 2021.

Signed and Sealed: May 28, 2021

James D. Kuhn, Commissioner