

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

WERNER ALTHAUS
APPELLANT,

CASE NO: 23R 1024

V.

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

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Lancaster County, parcel number 11-01-120-013-000.
2. The Lancaster County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$356,100 for tax year 2023.
3. Werner Althaus (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Lancaster County Board of Equalization (the County Board).
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$356,100 for tax year 2023.
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 September 19, 2024, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Nebraska State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
7. Werner Althaus was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Jared Patterson (the Appraiser) 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 the Commission considers an appeal of a decision of a county board of equalization, there are two burdens of proof.³ The first involves a presumption 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.⁴ 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.⁵
12. The second burden of proof requires that 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."⁶
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. 2022).

² See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018), *Brenner v. Banner Cnty. 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 Cnty. Freeholder Bd.*, 276 Neb. 1009, 1019, 759 N.W.2d 464, 473 (2009).

³ *Pinnacle Enters., Inc. v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equalization*, 320 Neb. 303, 309, ___ N.W.3d ___ (2025). See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283, 753 N.W.2d at 811 (quoting *Ideal Basic Indus. v. Nuckolls Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 231 Neb. 653, 654-55, 437 N.W.2d 501, 502 (1989)).

⁴ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, ___ N.W.3d at ___ (quoting *Cain v. Custer Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 315 Neb. 809, 818, 1 N.W.3d 512, 521 (2024)). See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283, 753 N.W.2d at 811 (quoting *Ideal Basic Indus.*, 231 Neb. at 654-55, 437 N.W.2d at 502).

⁵ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, ___ N.W.3d at ___.

⁶ *Id.* See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283-84, 753 N.W.2d at 811.

order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary.⁷

14. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁸
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.⁹
16. The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹⁰

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Taxpayer stated the Subject Property has had no upgrades or any remodel in the past 22 years. The sprinkler system is unusable as all the water lines have been broken. The Taxpayer stated he would not be able to sell for the current assessment.
18. The Taxpayer provided six comparable properties with many of them being similar or better than the Subject Property.
19. No property record files (PRF) were provided by the Taxpayer as instructed in the order for hearing. As noted in the order for hearing, "Copies of the county's PRF for any parcel you will present as a comparable parcel should be provided so that your claim can be properly analyzed. The information provided on the county's web page is not a property record file. A property record

⁷ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

⁸ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cnty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 174-75, 645 N.W.2d 821, 826 (2002).

⁹ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo Cnty.*, 179 Neb. 415, 418, 138 N.W.2d 641, 643 (1965) (determination of actual value) *abrogated on other grounds by Potts v. Bd. of Equalization*, 213 Neb. 37, 328 N.W.2d 175 (1982)); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. Cnty. Bd. of Equal. of York Cnty.*, 209 Neb. 465, 468, 308 N.W.2d 515, 518 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

¹⁰ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

file is only maintained in the office of the County Assessor and should be obtained from that office before the hearing.”¹¹

20. The Appraiser physically inspected the Subject Property to verify the quality and condition were correct. The Appraiser stated underground sprinklers are not part of the assessment.
21. The Appraiser provided comparable properties for the Subject Property and found the Subject Property is valued equally and fairly as compared to similar properties.
22. 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.
23. 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 2023 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2023 is:

Land	\$62,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$294,100</u>
Total	\$356,100
3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Lancaster County Treasurer and the Lancaster County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018 (Reissue 2018).

¹¹ See Order for Single Commissioner Hearing and Notice of Hearing issues August 13, 2024.

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 December 5, 2025.

Signed and Sealed: December 5, 2025



James D. Kuhn, Commissioner