

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

MATT HUMLICEK  
APPELLANT,

v.

PLATTE COUNTY BOARD OF  
EQUALIZATION,  
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 25R 0055

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

**I. BACKGROUND**

1. The Subject Property is a vacant residential parcel in Platte County, parcel number 710014042.
2. The Platte County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$11,250 for tax year 2025.
3. Matt Humlincek (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Platte County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested an assessed value of \$4,000 for tax year 2025.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$11,250 for tax year 2025.
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 November 19, 2025, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Nebraska State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner Jackie S. Russell.
7. Matt Humlincek was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Kari Urkoski (Assessor) 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.<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>

---

<sup>1</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2024).

<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.

14. 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>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 *Bottorf 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) (Cum. Supp. 2024).

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

17. The Subject Property is a vacant residential parcel with 12,496 square feet (SF) located on the south side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street in Duncan, NE. The 2025 taxable value is \$11,250, or \$0.90 per square foot.
18. The Taxpayer argued that the Subject Property value is arbitrary and unreasonable compared to other vacant land parcels in the neighborhood.
19. The Taxpayer provided two comparable properties for the Commission to consider. The properties are both vacant land parcels near the Subject Property located on the north side of 5<sup>th</sup> Street in Duncan, NE. Parcel 710013853 has 9,240 SF and is valued at \$5,540, or \$0.60 per SF, for tax year 2025. Parcel 710013860 has 10,560 SF and is valued at \$6,340, or \$0.60 per SF, for tax year 2025.
20. The Assessor stated that land valuations in Duncan, NE are based upon an allocation methodology with influence from paved and unpaved road access. All parcels with paved road access have land valuations of \$0.90 per SF while unpaved road access parcels have land valuations of \$0.60 per SF.
21. The Assessor provided aerial imagery showing that the Subject Property on 6<sup>th</sup> Street has paved road access, while the Taxpayer's comparable properties on 5<sup>th</sup> Street have gravel road access.
22. The Assessor provided multiple property record files to show the uniformity of the land valuations between paved and unpaved road access properties.
23. The Taxpayer did not provide evidence to show that paved access roads and gravel access roads have the same value per square foot.
24. The Taxpayer has not 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.

25. 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 2025 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2025 is:

Land	\$11,250
<u>Improvements</u>	\$ 0
Total	\$11,250

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Platte County Treasurer and the Platte 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 2025.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on February 11, 2026.

Signed and Sealed: February 11, 2026



---

Jackie S. Russell, Commissioner