

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

BEL FURY INVESTMENTS  
GROUP LLC,  
APPELLANT,

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD  
OF EQUALIZATION,  
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 21R 1040

DECISION AND ORDER  
REVERSING 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 1401410000.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$52,700 for tax year 2021.
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 \$52,700 for tax year 2021.
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 July 21, 2023, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam Street, 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, Lisa Humlicek, 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.<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>

---

<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).

13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>6</sup>
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 640 square foot ranch style residence constructed in 1920. The Subject Property has a quality rating of average and a condition rating of fair.
17. The Taxpayer alleged that the value of the Subject Property was negatively impacted by the condition of the property.
18. The Taxpayer presented a Property Evaluation Report (PER) prepared by Connie Watson, a contractor and construction estimator employed by the Taxpayer, indicating that \$45,100 of repairs were needed on the Subject Property. Included with the PER were photographs of the Subject Property showing the condition of the driveway, siding, doors, windows, foundation, gutters, downspouts, roof, flooring, and HVAC system.
19. The PER was dated 9 June 2020, but the Taxpayer stated that the condition of the Subject Property as described in the PER was the same on the assessment date at issue in this appeal.
20. The Taxpayer presented a 2017 insurance estimate for the repair of hail damage to the Subject Property, as well as an

---

<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).

<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).

- invoice for roof repairs that were completed in 2023, that contained before and after photographs of the roof replacement.
21. The County Board presented the Property Record File (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 attributed to each of the characteristics of residential properties in the area, including the Subject Property.
  22. The PRF shows that the market area in which the Subject Property is located was reappraised for tax year 2021.
  23. The County Appraisers stated that after reviewing the information presented to the Commission, including the PER, photographs, insurance estimate, and roof invoice, the condition rating of the Subject Property should be reduced to poor.
  24. The Taxpayer has presented information to demonstrate that the condition rating of fair for the Subject Property was arbitrary or unreasonable.
  25. The County Appraisers stated that they had a new opinion of value for the Subject Property of \$45,900, of which \$8,000 would be allocated to the land value and \$37,900 allocated to the improvements based on a change in the condition rating of the Subject Property.
  26. The Taxpayer agreed to the County Appraisers new opinion of value for the Subject Property.
  27. The Commission finds that the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2021 is \$45,900.
  28. 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.
  29. 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 vacated.

#### 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 vacated and reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2021 is:

Land	\$ 8,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$37,900</u>
Total	\$45,900

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 2021.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on January 3, 2024.

Signed and Sealed: January 3, 2024



---

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner