

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

ROSE M NELSON
APPELLANT,

V.

MORRILL COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION,
CHRISTOPHER M. BAIRD
APPELLEES.

CASE NO: 24R 0594

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

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Morrill County, parcel number 100026227.
2. The Morrill County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$106,085 for tax year 2024.
3. Christopher M. Baird (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Morrill County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$97,910 for tax year 2024.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$96,730 for tax year 2024.
5. The County Assessor appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on October 2, 2025, at Fairfield Inn and Suites by Marriott, 902 Winter Creek Drive, Scottsbluff, NE 69361, before Commissioner Jackie S. Russell.
7. Robert Brenner, Attorney, and Rose M. Nelson, County Assessor, were present at the hearing for the Appellant.
8. Kirk Fellhoelter, County Attorney, was present for the County Board.

9. Christopher M. Baird was present for the Taxpayer.

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 the Commission considers an appeal of a decision of a county board of equalization, there are two burdens of proof.³
13. 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
14. 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.⁶ The burden of showing such valuation to be

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.

unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.⁷

15. 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.⁸ Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁹
16. The Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.¹⁰ 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.¹¹
17. 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.¹² The Commission may consider all questions necessary to determine taxable value of property as it hears an appeal or cross appeal.¹³ 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

⁷ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, ___ N.W.3d at ___. See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283-84, 753 N.W.2d at 811.

⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

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

¹⁰ 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).

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

¹² Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018).

¹³ *Id.*

evaluation of the evidence presented to it.¹⁴ The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹⁵

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

18. The Subject Property is a one-story, single-family home built in 1978 with above grade and basement areas of 912 square feet (SF), eight plumbing fixtures, a detached garage with 576 SF, and a tool shed with 130 SF. The overall quality rating is fair and the condition rating is average. The lot size is 11,846 SF.
19. Ms. Nelson argued that the County Board arbitrarily and unreasonably reduced the Subject Property value without basis creating disequalization within the Subject Property neighborhood.
20. Mr. Baird argued to the County Board that the land value increase for the Subject Property was arbitrary and unreasonable due to consecutive increases in previous years.
21. The Commission must look to the value of the Subject Property as of January 1 of each tax year.¹⁶
22. The assessed value for real property may be different from year to year according to the circumstances.¹⁷ For this reason, a prior year's assessment is not relevant to the subsequent year's valuation.¹⁸ Similarly, prior assessments of other properties are not relevant to the subsequent assessment.¹⁹

¹⁴ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(6) (Reissue 2018).

¹⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

¹⁶ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301 (Cum. Supp. 2022).

¹⁷ *Affiliated Foods Coop. v. Madison Co. Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 614, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988); see Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1502 (Reissue 2018).

¹⁸ *Affiliated Foods Coop.*, 229 Neb. at 613, 428 N.W.2d at 206; *DeVore v. Board of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 354-55, 13 N.W.2d 451, 452-53 (1944).

¹⁹ *Kohl's Dep't Stores v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 10 Neb. App. 809, 814-15, 638 N.W.2d 877, 881 (2002).

23. All taxable real property, with the exception of agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation.²⁰
24. Under § 77-112, actual value of real property for purposes of taxation may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, (1) the sales comparison approach, taking into account factors such as location, zoning, and current functional use; (2) the income approach; and (3) the cost approach. This statute does not require use of all the specified factors, but requires use of applicable statutory factors, individually or in combination, to determine actual value of real estate for tax purposes.²¹
25. “[U]nder §§ 77-103.01, 77-112, and 77-1363, assessors are not limited to a single method of determining the actual value of property for tax purposes. Rather, assessors are charged with a duty to consider a wide range of relevant factors in order to arrive at a proper assessment which does not exceed actual value.²²
26. Mr. Barid and the County Attorney submitted Property Record Files (PRFs) for four properties to show they had sale prices below their assessed valuations as support for the County Board’s action. The properties were foreclosures that were remitted to Morrill County’s ownership in 2018 and then sold at auction after the January 1 assessment date, in late 2024. The County Attorney stated that the County no longer wanted to maintain the property and had no use for it as reason for the auction.
27. Ms. Nelson stated there was a revaluation conducted to the Subject Property’ neighborhood for 2024 and provided documentation showing uniformity in the application of the results. The increases (or decreases) to each lot in the market study area were dependent upon the property size, a land to

²⁰ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-201(1)-(3) (Cum. Supp. 2022).

²¹ *Cain v. Custer Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 298 Neb. 834, 845, 906 N.W.2d 285, 295 (2018).

²² *Id.*, 298 Neb. at 853, 906 N.W.2d at 299.

building residual study, and an assessment-to-sales ratio analysis, along with a comparable sales study within the study period.

28. The results of the land study affecting the Subject Property concluded that all lot sizes totaling 15,000 SF or less land area are valued at \$1.15 per square foot. This is also apparent on the PRFs provided by the Appellees.
29. Supportive materials from Ms. Nelson included an equalization study, Property Record Files (PRFs) of the discussed parcels, and the 2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator.
30. The Commission finds that based on the supportive materials, Ms. Nelson followed appraisal standards in the creation and application of the 2024 lot value revaluation to the Subject Property and its surrounding neighborhood.
31. The Appellant has produced sufficient competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
32. 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 2024 is vacated and reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2024 is:

Land	\$ 13,625
<u>Improvements</u>	\$ 92,460
Total	\$106,085

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.
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 January 16, 2026.

Signed and Sealed: January 16, 2026



Jackie S. Russell, Commissioner