



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

APPELLANT: Meda Kasza
DOCKET NO.: 12-23875.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 11-31-210-038-1038

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Meda Kasza, 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: \$580
IMPR.: \$12,154
TOTAL: \$12,734

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 2012 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 single residential condominium unit that has a 2.7947% interest in the condominium as a whole. The subject is 87 years old. The property has a 17,299 square foot site and is located in Rogers Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on August 27, 2012 for a price of \$50,000. The appellant's evidence includes a settlement statement and a Cook County Recorder of Deeds printout that indicate the seller was Wells Fargo Bank N.A. The appellant also submitted a Multiple Listing Service printout that indicates the subject was sold in a foreclosure sale. The Board notes that the appellant did not include any information in Section

IV-Recent Sale Data of the Property Tax Appeal Board's appeal form, as required by the Property Tax Appeal Board Rules. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect 10% of the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$12,737. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$127,340, land included, when using the 2012 level of assessment for class 2 property of 10% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on two comparable sales. The sales totaled \$241,000. A personal property reduction of one percent was deducted resulting in an adjusted consideration of \$238,590. The board divided this amount by the total percentage sold resulting in a market value of the building as a whole of \$4,387,190. This amount was multiplied by the subject's percentage of ownership of 2.7947% resulting in a market value for the subject unit of \$122,609.

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.

Based on the appellant's evidence, the Board finds that the sale of the subject in August 2012 for a price of \$50,000 was a "compulsory sale in the form of a foreclosure sale. A "compulsory sale" is defined as:

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.

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, when there is a recent sale of the subject, and that sale is a compulsory sale, the Board may consider evidence which would show whether the sale price was representative of the subject's fair cash value. See 35 ILCS 200/16-183 ("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."). Such evidence can include the descriptive and sales information for recently sold properties that are similar to the subject. See Id.

In this case, the board of review submitted two comparable sales. These comparables range in sale price from \$66,000 to \$175,000, including land. The subject's sale price of \$50,000 is below the range of these comparables, after adjustments are made to account for the units' slight difference in percentages of ownership. In addition, the subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$127,340 which is within the range of the comparables. Based on this record the Board finds the subject's sale price is not representative of the subject's fair cash value. Since there is no evidence that the sale price of the subject is at its fair cash value, the Board finds the subject is not overvalued and a reduction in the subject's assessment 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.



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: February 24, 2017



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.