



**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION
ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD**

APPELLANT: Shoab Akhoon
DOCKET NO.: 10-26228.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 15-10-103-056-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Shoab Akhoon, the appellant(s), by attorney Richard J. Caldarazzo, of Mar Cal Law, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **No Change** in the assessment of the property as established by the **Cook** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$2,062
IMPR.: \$21,160
TOTAL: \$23,222

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Cook County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2010 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject property consists of a multi-improvement property which contains a two-story dwelling of frame construction with 1,232 square feet of living area which was constructed in 1906. The second building is a one-story dwelling of masonry construction with 426 square feet of living area and was built in 1898. The property has a 3,300 square foot site and is located in Proviso Township, Cook County.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on three equity comparables.

The appellant also contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted a copy of a Cook County Recorder of Deeds printout showing the subject

sold. The appellant's attorney requested that the Board apply the level of assessment for class 2 properties of 10.00% as determined by the Cook County classification ordinance.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$23,222, and an improvement assessment of \$21,160, or \$12.76 per square foot of living area. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$232,220 or \$188.49 per square foot of living area for both improvements, land included, when applying the level of assessment for class 2 properties of 10.00% as determined by the Cook County classification ordinance.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted eight comparables, five of which with sales data for building #1 and four equity comparables, one of which with sales data, for building #2. In addition, the board of review submitted a brief stating that the subject's sale was not at fair market value due to the deed trail showing that a *lis pendens* lien was placed on the subject in August 2006 and that the subject was granted/conveyed to Pledged Prop II, LLC in October 2008.

Conclusion of Law

The taxpayer contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity for improvement #1 to be the board of review's comparables #2, #7, and #8. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$17.80 to \$20.02 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$12.76 per square foot of living area falls below the range established by the best comparables in this record. Based on this record the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified. The appellant failed to provide any evidence to protest the assessment for improvement #2.

Moreover, the appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal of the subject property, a recent sale, comparable sales or construction costs. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

In addressing the appellant's market value argument, the Board finds that the sale of the subject in October 2008 for \$38,000 is a "compulsory sale." A "compulsory sale" is defined as:

- (i) The sale of real estate for less than the amount owed to the mortgage lender or mortgagor, if the lender or mortgagor has agreed to the sale, commonly referred to as a "short sale" and (ii) the first sale of the real estate owned by a financial institution as a result of a judgment of foreclosure, transfer pursuant to a deed in lieu of foreclosure, or consent judgment, occurring after the foreclosure proceeding is complete.

35 ILCS 200/1-23. Real property in Illinois must be assessed at its fair cash value, which can only be estimated absent any compulsion on either party.

Illinois law requires that all real property be valued at its fair cash value, estimated at the price it would bring at a fair voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is likewise ready, willing, and able to buy, but is not forced to do so.

Board of Educ. of Meridian Community Unit School Dist. No. 223 v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 961 N.E.2d 794, 802, 356 Ill.Dec. 405, 413 (2d Dist. 2011) citing Chrysler Corp. v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 69 Ill.App.3d 207, 211 387 N.E.2d 351 (2d Dist. 1979)).

However, the Illinois General Assembly recently provided very clear guidance for the Board with regards to compulsory sales. Section 16-183 of the Illinois Property Tax Code states as follows:

The Property Tax Appeal Board shall consider compulsory sales of the comparable properties for the purpose of revising and correcting assessments, including those compulsory sales of comparable properties submitted by the taxpayer.

35 ILCS 200/16-183. Therefore, the Board is statutorily required to consider the compulsory sale of comparable properties submitted by the parties to revise and/or correct the subject's assessment. The Board finds that the mere assertion that the subject's sale was not at market solely because it is a compulsory sale is accorded no weight without evidence supporting that assertion.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board looks to the evidence presented by the parties. The appellant did not submit any sales data to support the subject's sale. The Board finds the board of review's comparables #2, #5, #6, #7, and #8 set the range of market value for the subject. These comparables were similar to the subject in size, age, and features. They sold from \$100.99 to \$253.21 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$188.49 per square foot of living area, including land, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. The subject's 2008 sale reflects a price of \$22.92 per square foot of living area which is vastly below the market data; and therefore, is unsupported.

Accordingly, in determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds that the appellant did not submit sufficient evidence to show the subject was overvalued. Therefore,

the Board finds that the appellant has not met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence and that the subject does not warrant a reduction based upon the market data submitted into evidence.

This is a final administrative decision of the Property Tax Appeal Board which is subject to review in the Circuit Court or Appellate Court under the provisions of the Administrative Review Law (735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq.) and section 16-195 of the Property Tax Code.



Chairman



Member

Member



Member

Member

DISSENTING: _____

CERTIFICATION

As Clerk of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board and the keeper of the Records thereof, I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete Final Administrative Decision of the Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board issued this date in the above entitled appeal, now of record in this said office.

Date: June 24, 2016



Clerk of the Property Tax Appeal Board

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Section 16-185 of the Property Tax Code provides in part:

"If the Property Tax Appeal Board renders a decision lowering the assessment of a particular parcel after the deadline for filing complaints with the Board of Review or after adjournment of

the session of the Board of Review at which assessments for the subsequent year are being considered, the taxpayer may, within 30 days after the date of written notice of the Property Tax Appeal Board's decision, appeal the assessment for the subsequent year directly to the Property Tax Appeal Board."

In order to comply with the above provision, YOU MUST FILE A PETITION AND EVIDENCE WITH THE PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE ENCLOSED DECISION IN ORDER TO APPEAL THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE SUBSEQUENT YEAR.

Based upon the issuance of a lowered assessment by the Property Tax Appeal Board, the refund of paid property taxes is the responsibility of your County Treasurer. Please contact that office with any questions you may have regarding the refund of paid property taxes.