

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

BEL FURY INVESTMENTS
GROUP LLC,
APPELLANT,

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 20R 0568

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 1301720002.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$82,800 for tax year 2020.
3. Bel Fury Investments 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 \$82,800 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 15, 2022, 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 (the 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 1.¹
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 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

¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2020).

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

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

⁴ *Id.* at 283-84.

⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

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

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16. The Subject Property is a residential parcel improved with two residences, a 528 square foot ranch style residence constructed in 1926 and a 672 square foot ranch style residence constructed in 1945.
17. The Taxpayer alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with that of other comparable properties.
18. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.⁹
19. "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
20. The Taxpayer presented the PRF for three properties located

⁶ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 174-75, 645 N.W.2d 821, 826 (2002).

⁷ *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).

⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

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

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

within one half mile of the Subject Property.

21. The Taxpayer presented a chart that adjusted the value of these three properties 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 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 Appraisers stated that the Subject Property had a quality rating of average while the other three properties presented had quality ratings of fair. The County Appraisers further stated that the other properties presented are in a different market area than the Subject Property and therefore would not be comparable to the Subject Property due to different market factors in each market area
23. The PRFs presented demonstrate that there are significant differences between the Subject Property and the three properties presented including quality of construction and age.
24. The Commission finds that the properties presented by the Taxpayer are not comparable to the Subject Property.
25. The Taxpayer alleges that the market areas determined by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
26. 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.
27. 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 were arbitrary or unreasonable.
28. The Taxpayer did not present information to demonstrate that the market areas utilized by the County Assessor were arbitrary

or unreasonable.

29. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with those of other comparable properties.
30. 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.
31. 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	\$ 4,300
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$78,500</u>
Total	\$82,800
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 November 8, 2023.

Signed and Sealed: November 8, 2023



Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner