

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

SAMEBEN LLC  
APPELLANT,

CASE NO: 20C 0427

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD  
OF EQUALIZATION,  
APPELLEE.

DECISION AND ORDER  
AFFIRMING THE DECISION  
OF THE DOUGLAS COUNTY  
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. The Subject Property is an improved commercial parcel in Douglas County, parcel number 2013012180.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$588,300 for tax year 2020.
3. Sameben LLC (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board).
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$588,300 for tax year 2020.
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 June 7, 2022, at Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam Street, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Monte Bowman was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Keith Nielsen with the County Assessor's Office (the County Appraiser) was present for the County Board.

## II. 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 a determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.<sup>2</sup>
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>

---

<sup>1</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2020).

<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, 759 N.W.2d 464, 473 (2009).

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

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 283-84.

<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, 174-75, 645 N.W.2d 821, 826 (2002).

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>

### III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16. Mr. Bowman argued that for due process reasons he should be allowed to use the prior year's values for the comparable properties because the valuations of comparable properties may be changed at the county protest level.
17. The Commission finds there is no merit in this due process argument since the Taxpayer has the opportunity for a de novo review of the valuation and equalization of the Subject Property before the Commission.<sup>9</sup>
18. Additionally, the assessed value for real property may be different from year to year according to the circumstances.<sup>10</sup> For this reason, a prior year's assessment is not relevant to the subsequent year's valuation.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, prior assessments of other properties are not relevant to the subsequent assessment.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo Cty.*, 179 Neb. 415, 418, 138 N.W.2d 641, 643 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. Cty. Bd. of Equal. of York Cty.*, 209 Neb. 465, 468, 308 N.W.2d 515, 518 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

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

<sup>9</sup> As noted above, the appellate review conducted by the Commission is a de novo review. See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(8) (2016 Cum. Supp.). "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).

<sup>10</sup> *Affiliated Foods Coop. v. Madison Co. Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 614, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988); see Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1502 (Reissue 2018).

<sup>11</sup> *Affiliated Foods Coop.*, 229 Neb. at 613, 428 N.W.2d at 206; *DeVore v. Board of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 354-55, 13 N.W.2d 451, 452-53 (1944).

<sup>12</sup> *Kohl's Dep't Stores v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 10 Neb. App. 809, 814-15, 638 N.W.2d 877, 881 (2002).

19. The Commission must look to the value of the Subject Property as of January 1 of each tax year.<sup>13</sup>
20. Mr. Bowman alleged that the improvement component and the land component of the Subject Property were not equalized with other comparable properties.
21. The Taxpayer presented information from the County Assessor's web site regarding five parcels of property. The information from the County Assessor's web site for two of these parcels was incomplete.
22. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.<sup>14</sup>
23. "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."<sup>15</sup>
24. The Taxpayer did not present the Property Record Files (PRFs) for the properties presented. Accordingly, the Commission cannot see the basis for the determination of assessed value for the properties presented by the Taxpayer or compare their characteristics to the characteristics of the Subject Property. The Commission is unable to determine the contribution of the different characteristics of the properties presented by the Taxpayer to the Subject Property.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat §77-1301(Reissue 2018)

<sup>14</sup> See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, *Property Assessment Valuation*, at 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010).

<sup>15</sup> Appraisal Institute, *Appraising Residential Properties*, at 334 (4th ed. 2007).

<sup>16</sup> For this reason, the Order for Single Commissioner Hearing and Notice issued to the Taxpayer on April 22, 2022, includes the following:

**NOTE:** *Copies of the County's Property Record File for any property 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.*

25. The County Appraiser stated that two of the properties presented by the Taxpayer have much larger land components than the Subject Property and would not be comparable.
26. The Commission finds that these two properties are not comparable to the Subject Property.
27. The County Board presented the PRF for the Subject Property. The PRF contains information about the characteristics of the Subject Property and information regarding the qualified sales that occurred in the economic area of the Subject Property. This information was used to determine the value of properties in the area, including the Subject Property.
28. The County Board also presented the PRF for sales of properties that are comparable to the Subject Property.
29. “Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1371, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach.”<sup>17</sup>
30. The PRFs presented show that the Subject Property and the county’s comparable properties were all valued using the income approach to valuation, a methodology specifically allowed by statute.
31. The County Appraiser stated that in using the income approach to value, the County Assessor is determining the total value of a property. Once the total valuation has been determined a portion of that value is allocated to the land component.
32. The PRF’s that the County Board presented demonstrate that this methodology is being applied uniformly to similar properties.
33. The information presented by the Taxpayer from the County Assessor’s web site regarding the 2020 assessments further supports a determination that valuations of commercial properties, including the Subject Property are uniform and proportionate.

---

<sup>17</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-112 (Reissue 2018).

34. 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.
35. 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.

**IV. 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 2020 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2020 is:

Land	\$116,300
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$472,000</u>
Total	\$588,300

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 2020.

7. This Decision and Order is effective on July 14, 2023.

Signed and Sealed: July 14, 2023



---

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner