

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

ROSE M. NELSON
APPELLANT,

CASE NO: 23R 0690

V.

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

MORRILL COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION, GRANT
ISKE
APPELLEE.

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel with two homes in Morrill County, parcel number 100008911.
2. The Morrill County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$98,740 for tax year 2023.
3. Grant Iske (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Morrill County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$87,070 for tax year 2023.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$87,305 for tax year 2023.
5. Rose M. Nelson appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on September 9, 2024, at Fairfield Inn and Suites by Marriott, 902 Winter Creek Drive, Scottsbluff, NE 69361, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
7. Grant Iske was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Robert M. Brenner, Attorney, and Rose M. Nelson (the Assessor) were present at the hearing.

9. Kirk M. Fellhoelter, Morrill County Attorney, was present for the County Board.

II. APPLICABLE LAW

10. All real property in Nebraska subject to taxation shall be assessed as of the effective date of January 1.¹
11. The Commission's review of a determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.²
12. 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
13. The order, decision, determination or action appealed from shall be affirmed unless evidence is adduced establishing that the

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.

order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary.⁵

14. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁶
15. 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
16. The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.⁸

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Assessor stated an inspection of the Subject Property was denied. The Assessor recommended no change in the assessment to the County Board. The County Board took action to lower the assessment and reject the Assessor's recommendation of no change in value. The Assessor was unsure what information the County Board relied on to quantify the action.
18. The Assessor provided the property record file (PRF) for the Subject Property and provided PRFs for comparable properties and sales comparables. The Assessor stated she increased Bridgeport residential property 14% to stay in compliance with Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-5023 requiring residential properties to be assessed within the acceptable range of 92% to 100% of actual value.
19. The Appellee argued that the Assessor's 14% increase to Bridgeport residential property was excessive. The Appellee

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).

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).

lowered the assessment to the 2022 assessment plus \$235 for a tool shed, but did not offer any evidence or support showing how they arrived at the final value of the Subject Property or tool shed.

20. The Appellee did not provide any evidence to support a lower value for the Subject Property, however, “[T]he County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the taxpayer establishes the Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary.”
21. The Taxpayer stated the Subject Property was purchased because of the proximity to his mother-in-law who lives across the street. The Taxpayer stated the Subject Property is on a dead-end street and close to the railroad tracks. The Taxpayer did not provide any evidence to quantify how these issues affect the value of the Subject Property.
22. Competent evidence can be “evidence tending to show that the valuation” adopted by a county board of equalization is questionable. In this case, the Assessor provided evidence to support her valuation. The Assessor provided comparable properties and comparable sales. The Assessor provided the residential correlation for Morrell County, showing that due to increasing sales prices as compared to assessments, an increase to all valuation groups in Morrell County was necessary to achieve equalization.
23. The Appellant 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.
24. The Appellant 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 2023 is vacated and reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2023 is:

Land	\$3,720
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$95,020</u>
Total	\$98,740

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Morrill County Treasurer and the Morrill 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 2023.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on July 16, 2025.

Signed and Sealed: July 16, 2025



James D. Kuhn, Commissioner