

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

John J. Basilevac,  
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,  
Appellee.

Case No: 14R 141

Decision and Order Reversing  
County Board of Equalization

**Background**

1. The Subject Property is a 1,683 sq. ft. residential property, with a legal description of: Briar Hills, Lot 51 Block 0 Irreg, Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$245,400 for tax year 2014.
3. The Taxpayer protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested a lower assessed value for tax year 2014.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$245,400 for tax year 2014.
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 22, 2016, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Third Floor, Room F, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven A. Keetle.
7. John J. Basilevac and Carol Basilevac were present at the hearing (Taxpayer).
8. Larry Thompsen of the Douglas County Assessor/Register of Deeds office was present for the County Board.

**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 the determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.<sup>2</sup>
11. When considering an appeal a presumption exists that the "board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon

<sup>1</sup> See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1301(1) (Reissue 2009).

<sup>2</sup> See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(8) (2014 Cum. Supp.), *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 (2009).

sufficient competent evidence to justify its action.”<sup>3</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. 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.”<sup>4</sup>

12. 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>5</sup>
13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>6</sup>
14. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.<sup>7</sup>
15. The Commission’s Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.<sup>8</sup>

#### Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

16. The Taxpayer alleged that the improvements on the Subject Property were over assessed for tax year 2014.
17. The Taxpayer offered information and testimony regarding the condition of the driveway, deck, and windows of the Subject Property.
18. Mr. Thompsen agreed, based on the information presented by the Taxpayer that the condition of the driveway, deck and windows of the Subject Property were not consistent with the condition rating of Good for the Subject Property.
19. The Taxpayer presented information regarding several estimates they had obtained to repair the driveway, deck and windows of the Subject Property.
20. The cost to repair the subject property to make the condition of the Subject Property consistent with its Good rating is \$25,364.
21. The Commission finds and determines that the assessed value of the improvements on the Subject Property are \$195,036 which with a land value of \$25,000 would result in a total assessed value of \$220,036 for tax year 2014.
22. The Taxpayer has produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 283, 753 N.W.2d 802, 811 (2008) (Citations omitted).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(9) (2014 Cum. Supp.).

<sup>6</sup> *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965)

(determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981)(determination of equalized taxable value).

<sup>8</sup> Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018(1) (2014 Cum. Supp.).

23. The Taxpayer 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.

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 2014, is Vacated and Reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2014 is:

Land	\$ 25,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$195,036</u>
Total	\$220,036

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (2014 Cum. Supp.).
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 2014.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on February 3, 2017.

Signed and Sealed: February 3, 2017

---

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner