

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

LAKEFRONT ENTERPRISES  
INC.,  
APPELLANT,

V.

DAWSON COUNTY BOARD  
OF EQUALIZATION,  
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 24C 0485

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

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. The Subject Property is an improved commercial parcel in Dawson County, parcel number 240205308.
2. The Dawson County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$242,670 for tax year 2024.
3. Lakefront Enterprises, Inc. (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Dawson County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$95,666 for tax year 2024.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$242,670 for tax year 2024.
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 23, 2025, at Best Western Plus North Platte Inn & Suites, 3201 S Jeffers St., North Platte, NE 69101, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
7. Tim Miller and Kayla Peterson was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Darlene M. Shafer (County Attorney) and Nic Van Cura (Assessor) 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 the Commission considers an appeal of a decision of a county board of equalization, there are two burdens of proof.<sup>3</sup>
12. 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.<sup>4</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.<sup>5</sup>
13. 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.<sup>6</sup> The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.<sup>7</sup>
14. The order, decision, determination or action appealed from shall

---

<sup>1</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2022).

<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> *Pinnacle Enters., Inc. v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equalization*, 320 Neb. 303, 309, 27 N.W.3d 1, 6 (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)).

<sup>4</sup> *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6 (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).

<sup>5</sup> *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6.

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

<sup>7</sup> *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6. See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283-84, 753 N.W.2d at 811.

be affirmed unless evidence is adduced establishing that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary.<sup>8</sup> Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>9</sup>

15. The Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.<sup>10</sup> The County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the Taxpayer establishes that the County Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary.<sup>11</sup>
16. In an appeal, the Commission may determine any question raised in the proceeding upon which an order, decision, determination, or action appealed from is based.<sup>12</sup> The Commission may consider all questions necessary to determine taxable value of property as it hears an appeal or cross appeal.<sup>13</sup> The Commission may take notice of judicially cognizable facts, may take notice of general, technical, or scientific facts within its specialized knowledge, and may utilize its experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge in the evaluation of the evidence presented to it.<sup>14</sup> The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

<sup>9</sup> *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6; *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (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. County Bd. of Equal. of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

<sup>11</sup> *Wheatland Indus., LLC v. Perkins Cty. Bd. of Equalization*, 304 Neb. 638, 935 N.W.2d 764 (2019) (quoting *Bottof v. Clay Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 7 Neb. App. 162, 168, 580 N.W.2d 561, 566 (1998)).

<sup>12</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(6) (Reissue 2018).

<sup>15</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

### III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Taxpayer, through Mr. Miller, brought this appeal asserting the Subject Property is overvalued.
18. At the hearing, the Taxpayer provided two property record files (PRFs). One is for the Subject Property and the other is for a property the Taxpayer asserts is comparable.
19. The Subject Property is a mobile home lot located in Gothenburg, Nebraska.
20. The County Assessor performed both an income approach analysis and a cost approach analysis in assessing the Subject Property. Under the cost approach analysis, the Subject Property's value is \$242,670 for tax year 2024. Under the income approach, the value for 2024 is \$359,600.
21. The County Assessor assessed the Subject Property based on the cost approach at \$242,670. The County Board affirmed this value.
22. The Taxpayer argued at the hearing that the income approach adversely affected the Subject Property's valuation and that there were certain additional expenses showing the assessed value was too high under the income approach. The Taxpayer also provided a list of these additional expenses.
23. Again, the County Assessor's valuation, and therefore the County Board's decision, was based on the cost approach, not the income approach.
24. To rebut the presumption in favor of the County Board, the evidence presented must be directed toward the actions of the County Assessor or the County Board.<sup>16</sup>
25. The Taxpayer provided no evidence to show the cost approach analysis is incorrect.
26. The second PRF presented by the Taxpayer is for a storage building located in Cozad, Nebraska.
27. A storage building is not comparable to mobile home lot.

---

<sup>16</sup> See *Betty L. Green Living Trust v. Morrill Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 299 Neb. 933, 946, 911 N.W.2d 551, 560 (2018).

28. 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.
29. 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 vacated/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 2024 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2024 is:

Land	\$ 57,200
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$185,470</u>
Total	\$242,670

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Dawson County Treasurer and the Dawson County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018.
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 2024.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on May 7, 2026.

**SIGNED AND SEALED: May 7, 2026.**

*SEAL*




---

James D. Kuhn, Commissioner