

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

BEL FURY INVESTMENT  
GROUP LLC  
APPELLANT,

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD  
OF EQUALIZATION,  
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 20R 0549

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

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Douglas County, parcel number 925660000.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$73,300 for tax year 2020.
3. Bel Fury Investment Group 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 \$73,300 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 November 1, 2021, at Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Arielle Bloemer, legal counsel, and Scott Bloemer were present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Scott Barnes and Kurt Skradis with the County Assessor's Office (County Appraisers) were 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. The Subject Property is a residential parcel improved with a 950 square foot ranch style residence constructed in 1950.
17. The Taxpayer alleged that the per square foot assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with comparable properties.
18. 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>9</sup>
19. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.<sup>10</sup>
20. The Taxpayer presented the PRF for five properties located within one half mile of the Subject Property.
21. The Taxpayer presented a chart that made adjustments to the value of these five additional comparable properties for tax year 2020 to adjust for differences in the characteristics of the properties. The Taxpayer stated that these adjustments were made based on his experience in the real estate market and the

---

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

<sup>10</sup> See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, *Property Assessment Valuation*, at 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010)

information contained in the PRFs. Although the Taxpayer may have knowledge of the Omaha real estate market, he is not a trained appraiser and none of the adjustments can be quantified by supporting evidence.

22. 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 for each of the tax years at issue. This information was used to determine the value attributed to each of the characteristics of residential properties in the area, including the Subject Property.
23. The PRF shows that the market area in which the Subject Property is located was reappraised for tax year 2020.
24. The County Appraisers stated that four of the five properties presented by the Taxpayer are of a lower quality of construction and are located in different market areas than the Subject Property and therefore would not be comparable to the Subject Property due to different cost factors and characteristics as well as different market factors in each market area.
25. The PRFs presented demonstrate that there are significant differences between the Subject Property and four of the properties presented including quality of construction and location.
26. The Commission finds that these four properties presented by the Taxpayer are not comparable to the Subject Property.
27. The Taxpayer alleges that the market areas determined by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
28. The County Appraisers discussed the qualified sales that occurred in the economic area of the Subject Property for each of the tax years at issue in the Subject Property's market area and presented the assessment statistics to support the market area adjustments made to the valuation of the Subject Property.
29. The Taxpayer did not present sales information to support the

allegation that the difference in market area adjustments between the Subject Property and the other properties presented are arbitrary or unreasonable.

30. The Taxpayer did not present information to demonstrate that the market areas utilized by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
31. The County Appraisers stated that the fifth property presented by the Taxpayer was in the same market area and of the same quality of construction as the Subject Property. The County Appraisers further stated that the difference in per square foot values between the Subject Property and the fifth comparable property was due to differences in amenities.
32. The PRFs presented show for the show that the same cost factors and market adjustments were made to the fifth property presented by the Taxpayer and the Subject Property where the characteristics were the same but that differences such as type of siding, fireplace, and porches account for differences in the per square foot values of these properties.
33. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the valuation of similarly situated properties were set at materially different levels entitling the Subject Property to a reduction assessed value under the court's determination in *Scribante*.
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	\$12,900
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$60,400</u>
Total	\$73,300

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 E March 31, 2023.

Signed and Sealed: March 31, 2023



\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner