

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION ILLINOIS PROPERTY TAX APPEAL BOARD

APPELLANT:	Santash Padney
DOCKET NO.:	11-32309.001-R-1
PARCEL NO .:	07-14-411-009-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Santash Padney, the appellant(s), by attorney David C. Dunkin, of Arnstein & Lehr, LLP 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:	\$ 11,745
IMPR.:	\$ 44,619
TOTAL:	\$ 56,364

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 2011 tax year. The Property Tax Appeal Board (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject consists of a two-story dwelling of frame construction with 4,027 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 13 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a two-car garage. The property has a 14,237 square foot site, and is located in Schaumburg, Schaumburg Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-08 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. No evidence was submitted as to whether the subject was owner-occupied.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on January 21, 2010 for a price of \$500,000, or \$124.16 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this

evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$56,364. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$563,640, or \$139.97 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2011 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.00% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted four equity comparables and four sale comparables. The board of review's evidence also states that the subject sold in January 2010 for \$500,000, and that this sale "was a short sale due to mold damage," and therefore, was "not an arm's length transaction."

At hearing, counsel for the appellant reaffirmed the evidence previously submitted. The appellant also submitted a printout from the MLS showing that the subject was purchased on January 21, 2010 for \$500,000 pursuant to a short sale. The MLS printout was accepted into evidence without objection from the board of review analyst and marked as "Appellant's Hearing Exhibit A."

The board of review analyst submitted a printout from redfin.com. The Board accepted the printout from redfin.com into evidence without objection from the appellant's counsel, and marked it as "Board of Review Hearing Exhibit A." The printout from redfin.com states that the subject was sold pursuant to a foreclosure. The board of review analyst also submitted a supplemental brief and supporting exhibits of the subject's sale from January 21, 2010 for \$500,000. The Board accepted the supplemental brief and supporting exhibits into evidence without objection from the appellant's counsel, and marked it as "Board of Review Hearing Exhibit B." The supplemental brief argued that the sale of the subject was a compulsory sale and that it was, therefore, not an arm's-length transaction. The exhibits to the supplemental brief included printouts from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds' website showing that a *lis pendens* was filed on the subject on June 23, 2008 by HSBC Bank, USA, and that between March 2010 and July 2015, the appellant has taken out three mortgages on the property totaling \$950,000.

In rebuttal, counsel for the appellant argued that the sale of the subject is the best indication of the subject's fair market value as it was an arm's-length transaction and was listed on the market for nearly one year.

Conclusion of Law

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.

The Board finds that the sale of the subject in January 2010 for \$500,000 was 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 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. The Board finds that the sale of the subject in January 2010 is a compulsory sale, in the form of a short sale, based on the MLS printout submitted by the appellant at hearing, and the supplemental brief and supporting exhibits submitted by the board of review at hearing.

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.

Bd. of Educ. of Meridian Cmty. Unit Sch. Dist. No. 223 v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 2011 IL App (2d) 100068, ¶ 36 (citing Chrysler Corp. v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 69 Ill.App.3d 207, 211 (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 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 sales of comparable properties submitted by the parties to revise and/or correct the subject's assessment. In this appeal, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales. The Board finds board of review comparables #1, #2, and #3 to be most similar to the subject. These comparables sold for prices ranging from \$185.97 to \$219.15 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's sale price reflects a market value of \$124.16 per square foot of living area, including land, which is well below the range established by the best comparables in this record. Therefore, the Board finds that the sale of the subject in January 2010 for \$500,000 was below the subject's fair cash value. Since there is no evidence that the sale price of the subject was at its fair cash value, the Board finds that the subject is not overvalued and a reduction is not warranted.

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.

Mano Moios Chairman Member Member Member Acting 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:

September 23, 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 <u>PETITION AND</u> <u>EVIDENCE</u> 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.