

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

MATTHEW MAUDE
APPELLANT,

CASE NO: 25R 1041

v.

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

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

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Lancaster County, parcel number 09-13-409-015-000.
2. The Lancaster County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$986,400 for tax year 2025.
3. Matthew Maude (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 \$986,400 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 August 12, 2026, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, 500 S 16th St., Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner Jackie S. Russell.
7. Matt Maude was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Tim Johns (Appraiser) and Lexi LaBeau 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 1.¹
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
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.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
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.⁶ The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.⁷

¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2024).

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 *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)).

⁴ *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).

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

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

⁷ *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.⁸ Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁹
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.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
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.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 evaluation of the evidence presented to it.¹⁴ The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹⁵

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

⁹ *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).

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.*

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

¹⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Cum. Supp. 2024).

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Subject Property is a one and one-half story, single-family home built in 1993 with 4,193 square feet (SF) above grade, and basement area of 2,932 SF of which 1,500 SF is fully finished. There are 23 plumbing fixtures, two fireplaces, and a built-in garage with 1,075 SF. The overall quality rating is 4.0 (good), and the condition/desirability/utility (CDU) rating is 5.0 (average plus).
18. The Taxpayer argued that the valuation increase for the Subject Property is arbitrary and unreasonable based on the provided appraisal report from 2023.
19. The Taxpayer argued that the market conditions have not changed enough to warrant the increase placed on the Subject Property.
20. The Taxpayer provided an appraisal report completed by Brent Van Slyke for the Subject Property with an opinion of market value as of August 16, 2023, and suggested a valuation between that of the appraisal and that of the County for 2025.
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
23. All real property, other than agricultural land and horticultural land, is valued at 100% of its actual value.¹⁹

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 Title 350 Neb. Admin. Code, ch.10 § 003.01A (10/2014).

24. A determination of actual value may be made by using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods.²⁰ The methods expressly stated in statute are the sales comparison approach, the income approach, and the cost approach.²¹
25. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the information provided in the Van Slyke report still holds relevancy for the Subject Property in setting the 2025 valuation due to fluctuations in the market. The Van Slyke report does not show recent sales comparables to the Subject Property relevant to 2025; therefore, the Commission gives the report little weight for the 2025 valuation.
26. The Appraiser verified the data within the Property Record File (PRF) of the Subject Property with the Taxpayer at hearing.
27. The Taxpayer stated that the Subject Property data appeared correct on the PRF.
28. The Appraiser stated there was a revaluation conducted to the Subject Property's neighborhood for 2025. The increases (or decreases) to each property in the market study area were dependent upon their property data components and comparable sales within the study period.
29. The Appraiser provided a Comparable Sales Report to support the Subject Property valuation with recently sold properties along with their PRFs. These documents detailed the components of comparability and adjustments to the sale prices based on professionally accepted mass appraisal methods to support the Subject Property's 2025 valuation.
30. 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.
31. The Taxpayer has not adduced clear and convincing evidence that the determination of the County Board is arbitrary or

²⁰ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-112 (Reissue 2018).

²¹ *Id.*

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	\$230,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$756,400</u>
Total	\$986,400

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.
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 September 29, 2026.

SIGNED AND SEALED: September 29, 2026.

SEAL



Jackie S. Russell, Commissioner