

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

J. Ignatius Didulo,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case No: 19R 0394

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 1,494 square foot ranch style residence, with a legal description of: Turnbridge Lot 131, Block 0, Irreg., Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$194,500 for tax year 2019.
3. J. Ignatius Didulo (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested a lower assessed value for tax year 2019.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$194,500 for tax year 2019.
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 March 29, 2021, at Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam Street, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. J. Ignatius and Shari Didulo were present at the hearing.
8. Kurt Skradis with 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 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 alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property was higher than other comparable properties.
17. The Taxpayer presented the 2021 tax year Property Record Files (PRF) for the Subject Property and five other nearby properties.
18. 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.
19. The County Appraiser confirmed that certain characteristics of the properties presented by the Taxpayer were the same from tax year 2021 to the tax year at issue in these appeals, tax year 2019.
20. The 2021 PRFs indicate that while many of its characteristics are similar to the other properties presented, the Subject Property has more finished basement than any of the other properties presented by the Taxpayer.

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).

21. The assessed values for all of the properties presented were different from tax year 2019 to tax year 2021, due to a reappraisal of the area conducted for tax year 2020.
22. Comparing the PRF of the Subject Property for tax year 2019 to the PRF for tax year 2021 indicated that the values attributed to different characteristics of the Subject Property were different for each of the tax years.
23. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.⁹
24. “A sales comparison adjustment is made to account (in dollars or a percentage) for a specific difference between the subject property and a comparable property. As the comparable is made more like the subject, its price is brought closer to the subject’s unknown value.”¹⁰
25. Without the details contained in the 2019 PRF of other comparable properties, the Commission is unable to determine the contributions of the various amenities or features of the properties, such as quality, condition, basement finish, etc., to the value of the improvements.¹¹
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 2019 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2019 is:

Land	\$ 22,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$172,500</u>
Total	\$194,500

⁹ See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, *Property Assessment Valuation* 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010).

¹⁰ Appraisal Institute, *Appraising Residential Properties* 334 (4th ed. 2007).

¹¹ For this reason, the Order for Single Commissioner Hearing and Notice issued to the Taxpayer on July 30, 2020, includes the following:

NOTE: *Copies of the County’s Property Record File for any parcel you will present as a comparable parcel should be provided so that your claim can be properly analyzed. The information provided on the County’s web page is not a property record file. A Property Record File is only maintained in the office of the County Assessor and should be obtained from that office prior to the hearing.*

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 2019.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on November 10, 2021.

Signed and Sealed: November 10, 2021

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner