BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

AARON R. BLAKE APPELLANT,

V.

PLATTE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, APPELLEE. CASE NO: 21R 0382

DECISION AND ORDER REVERSING THE DECISION OF THE PLATTE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

I. BACKGROUND

- 1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Platte County, parcel number 0710107177.
- 2. The Platte County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$257,615 for tax year 2021.
- 3. Aaron R. Blake (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Platte County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$220,735 for tax year 2021.
- 4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$257,615 for tax year 2021.
- 5. The Taxpayer appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
- A Single Commissioner hearing was held on October 18, 2022, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Nebraska State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
- 7. Aaron R. Blake was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
- 8. Tom Placzek (the Assessor) 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 1.¹
- 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
- 13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁶

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).

⁶ 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.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 Taxpayer stated he had an appraisal done in May of 2021 for refinance purposes that indicated a value of \$250,000.
- 17. The Taxpayer stated the Subject Property is inferior to many other neighborhood properties as some have had remodeling done, some have newer finishes, and his home is not on a corner lot. No property record files were provided by the Taxpayer for any of the homes he talked about as being comparable.
- 18. The Assessor stated the comparable properties used in the Taxpayers appraisal were not available to him at the time he set the value on the Subject Property as they are not within the three-year window used to build a sales file, they were all more recent sales. The Assessor stated he uses mass appraisal when valuing properties in Platte County, which is greatly different than an independent appraisal of a single property. The Assessor stated he felt the current assessment was correct and equalized with the neighborhood.
- 19. The USPAP compliant independent appraisal report, although being done after January 1, 2021 is considered the best evidence of value for a single property and the value should be \$250,000 for tax year 2021.

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).

- 20. 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.
- 21. The Taxpayer has 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 reversed.

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 2021 is affirmed.
- 2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2021 is:



- 3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Platte County Treasurer and the Platte 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 2021.
- 7. This Decision and Order is effective on February 13, 2023.

Signed and Sealed: February 13, 2023



James D. Kuhn, Commissioner