

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

BJB HOLDINGS, LLC,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	Case No. 10R 492
	)	
v.	)	DECISION AND ORDER
	)	AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF
DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF	)	THE DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF
EQUALIZATION,	)	EQUALIZATION
	)	
Appellee.	)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by BJB Holdings, LLC ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Commission's Hearing Room on the sixth floor of the Nebraska State Office Building in the City of Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, on May 18, 2011, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued December 7, 2010, as amended by an Order dated January 12, 2011. Commissioner Warnes, Vice-Chairperson of the Commission, was the presiding hearing officer. Commissioner Wickersham, Chairperson of the Commission, was absent. Commissioner Warnes, as Vice-Chairperson acting in the absence of the Chairperson, designated Commissioners Warnes, Salmon, and Hotz as a panel of the Commission to hear the appeal. Commissioner Hotz was excused. Commissioner Salmon was present. The appeal was heard by a quorum of a panel of the Commission.

Betty Donellan, Managing Member of BJB Holdings, LLC, was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Thomas S. Barrett, a Deputy County Attorney for Douglas County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Douglas County Board of Equalization ("the County Board").

The Commission took statutory notice, received exhibits, and heard testimony.

The Commission is required to state its final decision and order concerning an appeal, with findings of fact and conclusions of law, on the record or in writing. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Reissue 2009). The final decision and order of the Commission in this case is as follows.

**I.  
ISSUES**

The Taxpayer has asserted that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2010, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board, determining actual value of the subject property, is unreasonable or arbitrary; and

The actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2010.

The Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2010, is not equalized with the taxable value of other real property. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board determining the equalized taxable value of the subject property is unreasonable or arbitrary;

Whether the equalized taxable value of the subject property was determined by the County Board in a manner and an amount that is uniform and proportionate as required by Nebraska's Constitution in Article VIII §1; and

The equalized taxable value of the subject property on January 1, 2010.

**II.  
FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Commission finds and determines that:

1. The Taxpayer has a sufficient interest in the outcome of the above captioned appeal to maintain the appeal.
2. The parcel of real property to which this appeal pertains ("the Subject Property") is described in the table below.
3. Actual value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2010, ("the assessment date") by the Douglas County Assessor, value as proposed in a timely protest, and actual value as determined by the County Board is shown in the following table:

Case No. 10R 492

Description: CLAIRMONT LOT 4 BLOCK 1 50 x 142, Douglas County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$6,700.00	Included in Total	\$6,700.00
Improvement	\$70,500.00	Included in Total	\$70,500.00
Total	\$77,200.00	\$20,500.00	\$77,200.00

4. An appeal of the County Board's decision was filed with the Commission.
5. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on December 7, 2010, as amended by an Order issued on January 12, 2011, set a hearing of the appeal for May 18, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. CDT.

6. An Affidavit of Service, which appears in the records of the Commission, establishes that a copy of the Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing was served on all parties.
7. Actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2010 is:

Case No. 10R 492

Land value	\$6,700.00
Improvement value	<u>\$70,500.00</u>
Total value	<u><u>\$77,200.00.</u></u>

### **III. APPLICABLE LAW**

1. Subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission in this appeal is over all questions necessary to determine taxable value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(7) (Reissue 2009).
2. “Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm’s length transaction, between a willing buyer and a willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses to which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property the analysis shall include a full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights valued.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2009).
3. “Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section 77-1371, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2009).

4. “Actual value, market value, and fair market value mean exactly the same thing.”  
*Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Board of Equalization, et al.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 180, 645 N.W.2d 821, 829 (2002).
5. Taxable value is the percentage of actual value subject to taxation as directed by section 77-201 of Nebraska Statutes and has the same meaning as assessed value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-131 (Reissue 2009).
6. All taxable real property, with the exception of agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) (Reissue 2009).
7. “Taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution.” Neb. Const., Art. VIII, §1.
8. Equalization is the process of ensuring that all taxable property is placed on the assessment rolls at a uniform percentage of its actual value. *MAPCO Ammonia Pipeline v. State Bd. of Equal.*, 238 Neb. 565, 471 N.W.2d 734 (1991).
9. The purpose of equalization of assessments is to bring the assessment of different parts of a taxing district to the same relative standard, so that no one of the parts may be compelled to pay a disproportionate part of the tax. *MAPCO Ammonia Pipeline v. State Bd. of Equal.*, 238 Neb. 565, 471 N.W.2d 734 (1991); *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623, (1999).

10. Equalization to obtain proportionate valuation requires a comparison of the ratio of assessed to actual value for the subject property and comparable property. *See Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).
11. Uniformity requires that whatever methods are used to determine actual or taxable value for various classifications of real property that the results be correlated to show uniformity. *Banner County v. State Board of Equalization*, 226 Neb. 236, 411 N.W.2d 35 (1987).
12. Taxpayers are entitled to have their property assessed uniformly and proportionately, even though the result may be that it is assessed at less than the actual value. *Equitable Life v. Lincoln County Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 60, 425 N.W.2d 320 (1988); *Fremont Plaza v. Dodge County Bd. of Equal.*, 225 Neb. 303, 405 N.W.2d 555 (1987).
13. The constitutional requirement of uniformity in taxation extends to both rate and valuation. *First Nat. Bank & Trust Co. v. County of Lancaster*, 177 Neb. 390, 128 N.W.2d 820 (1964).
14. In the evaluation of real property for tax purposes, where buildings and improvements are taxable as a part of the real estate, the critical issue is the actual value of the entire property, not the proportion of that value which is allocated to the land or to the buildings and improvements by the appraiser. *Bumgarner v. Valley County*, 208 Neb. 361, 303 N.W.2d 307 (1981).
15. If taxable values are to be equalized it is necessary for a Taxpayer to establish by clear and convincing evidence that valuation placed on his or her property when compared with valuations placed on similar property is grossly excessive and is the result of systematic

will or failure of a plain legal duty, and not mere error of judgement. There must be something more, something which in effect amounts to an intentional violation of the essential principle of practical uniformity. *Newman v. County of Dawson*, 167 Neb. 666, 94 N.W.2d 47 (1959).

16. A presumption exists that the County Board has faithfully performed its duties and has acted on competent evidence. *City of York v. York County Bd. Of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 64 N.W.2d 445 (2003).
17. The presumption in favor of the county board may be classified as a principle of procedure involving the burden of proof, namely, a taxpayer has the burden to prove that action by a board of equalization fixing or determining valuation of real estate for tax purposes is unauthorized by or contrary to constitutional or statutory provisions governing taxation. *Gordman Properties Company v. Board of Equalization of Hall County*, 225 Neb. 169, 403 N.W.2d 366 (1987).
18. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. *Id.*
19. 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. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (8) (Reissue 2009).
20. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action appealed from was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence. *See, e.g., Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

21. "Clear and convincing evidence means and is that amount of evidence which produces in the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction about the existence of a fact to be proved."  
*Castellano v. Bitkower*, 216 Neb. 806, 812, 346 N.W.2d 249, 253 (1984).
22. A decision is "arbitrary" when it is made in disregard of the facts and circumstances and without some basis which could lead a reasonable person to the same conclusion. *Phelps Cty. Bd. of Equal. v. Graf*, 258 Neb 810, 606 N.W.2d 736 (2000).
23. A decision is unreasonable only if the evidence presented leaves no room for differences of opinion among reasonable minds. *Pittman v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 258 Neb 390, 603 N.W.2d 447 (1999).
24. A corporate officer or other representative of an entity, must be shown to be familiar with the property in question and have a knowledge of values generally in the vicinity to be qualified to offer an opinion of value. *Kohl's Dept. Stores v. Douglas County Bd. of Equal.*, 10 Neb.App. 809, 638 N.W.2d 881 (2002).
25. The County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the taxpayer establishes the Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Bottorf v. Clay County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 162, 580 N.W.2d 561 (1998).
26. A Taxpayer, who only produced evidence that was aimed at discrediting valuation methods utilized by the county assessor, failed to meet burden of proving that value of property was not fairly and proportionately equalized or that valuation placed upon property for tax purposes was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983).

27. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the subject property in order to successfully claim that the subject property is overvalued. Cf. *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981); *Arenson v. Cedar County*, 212 Neb. 62, 321 N.W.2d 427 (1982)(determination of equalized taxable value); *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value).

#### **IV. ANALYSIS**

The subject property is a residential parcel improved with a 1 ½ story duplex with 1,892 square feet of living area built in 1918 and remodeled in 1987. (E2:5). The rating of the duplex is average for quality and fair for condition. (E2:5).

The Taxpayer alleged that the purchase price she paid for the parcel on October 8, 2009, of \$20,500, is definitive evidence of the actual value of the subject property. The property record file for the subject property shows that the subject property was purchased by the Taxpayer from a banking institution. (E2:3). The evidence was unclear as to whether the subject property had been foreclosed upon, but the property record file shows that the sale prior to the conveyance to the Taxpayer had been on August 6, 2008 for \$77,500 and was a Deed of Trust (TRD). (E2:3). The Taxpayer testified that the purchase of the subject property was made through a "national auction" process used by the banking institution and she alleges that the sale is an arm's length transaction. Subsequent to the Taxpayer's purchase of the subject property, repairs and improvements were made prior to January 1, 2010, in the amount of \$21,000. Testimony of the Taxpayer's husband was that the subject property was habitable on January 1, 2010. Water

damage occurred to the subject property surrounding January 1, 2010, but the evidence was unclear as to the exact date of the occurrence. No notice of the damage was transmitted to the County Assessor.

Actual value of real property is defined in Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2009) for purposes of taxation as

“...the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section 77-1371, (2) (Reissue 2009) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if a willing buyer and willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses to which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used.”

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1371 provides guidelines which shall be considered in determining what constitutes a comparable sale: Item (4) of this guideline states consideration should be given to “ whether sales or transfers made in connection with foreclosure, bankruptcy, or condemnations, in lieu of foreclosure, or in consideration of other legal actions should be excluded from comparable sales analysis as not reflecting current market value.”

“It is true that the purchase price of property may be taken into consideration in determining the actual value thereof for assessment purposes, together with all other relevant elements pertaining to such issue; however, standing alone, it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes. Other matters

relevant to the actual value thereof must be considered in connection with the sale price to determine actual value. Sale price is not synonymous with actual value or fair market value.” *Forney v. Box Butte County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 417, 424, 582 N.W.2D 631, 637 (1998).

The Commission notes that the sales price of a property is but one indicia of its market value. *Potts v Board of Equalization of Hamilton County*, 213 Neb. 37, 48, 328 N.W.2d 175, 328 (1982). In the *Potts* case the court ruled "... standing alone (sale price), it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes, and many other matters relevant to the actual value of property appear in the record and must be considered in connection with the purchase price to determine the actual value". *Id.* at 47, 328 N.W. 2d at 180 (quoting *Novak v. Board of Equalization*, 145 Neb. 664,666, 17 N.W.2d, 882, 883 (1945)). The *Potts* case further states "The true test in all cases is to arrive at actual value, meaning value in the market in the ordinary course of trade". *Id.* at 48, 328 N.W. 2d at 180 (quoting *Collier v. County of Logan*, 169 Neb. 1, 8, 97 N.W.2d 879, 885 (1959)). Thus, the Commission determines that it must look to other indicators of market value besides sale price to determine if the sale price is in fact a valid indicia of market value and if it is not, what is the market value for the subject property.

The Commission has reviewed all of the evidence presented to it by the Taxpayer. The Commission sustained the objection by the County to the attempt by the Taxpayer to introduce written evidence due to the untimely submission of the Taxpayer’s evidence and its finding that good cause was not shown for the Taxpayer’s failure to timely exchange evidence. The Commission’s Order for Hearing, paragraph 11, requires that the parties exchange evidence intended to be used at the time of hearing within 30 days of the appeal hearing date. Paragraph

13 of the same order requires the property record files be provided as evidence for any parcels to be used as “comparable” parcels.

A taxpayer who offers no evidence that the subject property is valued in excess of its actual value and who only produces evidence that is aimed at discrediting the valuation methods utilized by the county assessor, fails to meet his or her burden of proving that the value of the property was not fairly and proportionately equalized or that valuation placed upon the property for tax purposes was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983).

The testimony of the appraiser for the County Assessor testified that the sales comparison approach using multiple regression analysis was used to value the subject property for 2010. An explanation of this valuation approach is found on Exhibit 2 page 7. The Commission has reviewed the County’s Assessment Report which includes the property record file for the subject property provided by the County and the “market calculation detail” sheet. (E2 and E2:11). The Commission finds that the appraisal techniques are in accordance with professionally accepted mass appraisal standards and the appraised valuation of \$77,200 shown on Exhibit 2 page 11 is to be given great weight.

“There is a presumption that a board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action. The presumption remains until there is competent evidence to the contrary presented, and the presumption disappears when there is competent evidence on appeal to the contrary. From that point on, 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.” *Brenner v. Banner County Bd. Of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 283-284, 753 N.W.2d 802, 811 (2008) (quoting *Ideal Basic Indus v. Nuckolls Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 231 Neb. 653, 654-55, 437 N.W.2d 501, 502 (1989)).

In an appeal

“the burden of persuasion imposed on the complaining taxpayer is not met by showing a mere difference of opinion unless it is established by clear and convincing evidence that the valuation placed upon his property when compared to valuations placed on other similar property is grossly excessive and is the result of a systematic exercise of intentional will or failure of plain duty, and not mere errors of judgment.” *Id.* at 284, 276 N.W.2d at 812 (quoting *Bumgamer v. County of Valley*, 208 Neb. 361, 366, N.W.2d 307, 310 (1981)).

A taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of its property in order to successfully claim that a property is overvalued. *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N. W. 2d 515 (1981).

The Commission finds that the Taxpayer has not provided competent evidence to rebut the presumption that the County Board faithfully performed its duties and had sufficient competent evidence to make its determination. In addition, the Commission finds that the Taxpayer has not proven by clear and convincing evidence that the determination of the Douglas County Board was arbitrary or unreasonable.

The appeal of the Taxpayer is denied.

**V.  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The Commission has subject matter jurisdiction in this appeal.
2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to this appeal.
3. The Taxpayer has not produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its official duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
4. The Taxpayer has not adduced sufficient, clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the County Board is unreasonable or arbitrary and the decision of the County Board should be affirmed.

**VI.  
ORDER**

**IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. The decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date, January 1, 2010, is affirmed.
2. Actual value, for the tax year 2010, of the subject property is:

Case No. 10R 492

Land value	\$6,700.00
Improvement value	<u>\$70,500.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$77,200.00.</u>

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer, and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Reissue 2009).
4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this order is denied.
5. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
6. This decision shall only be applicable to tax year 2010.
7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on May 25, 2011.

Signed and Sealed. May 25, 2011.

---

Nancy J. Salmon, Commissioner

---

William C. Warnes, Commissioner

**SEAL**

**APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION MUST SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF NEB. REV. STAT. §77-5019 (REISSUE 2009), OTHER PROVISIONS OF NEBRASKA STATUTES, AND COURT RULES.**