



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

APPELLANT: Yuefa Xiao
DOCKET NO.: 13-28312.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 27-24-307-001-1009

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Yuefa Xiao, the appellant(s); and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** 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: \$ 837
IMPR.: \$ 5,523
TOTAL: \$ 6,360

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 2013 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 condominium unit with a 3.0222% ownership interest in the common elements. The property is located in Tinley Park, Orland Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

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 February 8, 2013 for a price of \$63,600. In Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the Board's residential appeal form, the appellant stated that the subject was sold pursuant to a foreclosure. The printout from the MLS submitted by the appellant states that sale of the subject was a "Pre-Foreclosure." Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to 10.00% of the purchase price.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$8,939. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$89,390 when applying the 2013 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.00% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a memorandum, which shows that two units in the subject's building, or 6.3729% of ownership, sold from June 2010 to May 2011 for an aggregate price of \$235,500. The board of review also included the sale of the subject in February 2013 for \$64,000 in its analysis. The aggregate sale price for the two units, plus the sale price for the subject, was then divided by the percentage of interest of the units sold to arrive at a total market value for the building of \$3,187,832. The subject's percentage of ownership was then utilized to arrive at a market value for the subject of \$96,343.

The board of review also submitted a supplemental brief arguing that the sale of the subject was a compulsory sale, and therefore, the sale was not an arm's length transaction and the sale price does not represent the subject's fair cash value. In support of this argument, the board of review submitted a printout from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds' website showing that a *lis pendens* was filed on the subject by Chase Home Finance, LLC on July 13, 2010, that Chase Home Finance assigned its interest in the subject to the Federal National Mortgage Association on June 30, 2011, that a judicial sale deed conveyed the subject from the Judicial Sales Corporation to Federal National Mortgage Association on August 28, 2012, and that a special warranty deed conveyed the subject from the Federal National Mortgage Association to the Kuo Yanjin on February 28, 2013. The board of review also submitted copies of the *lis pendens*, judicial sale deed, the special warranty deed, and the Real Property Transfer Tax Declaration. The latter document states that the subject will not be the buyer's principal residence, and, therefore, the subject is not owner occupied. That document also states that the sale of the subject was a "Bank REO (Real Estate Owned)."

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 meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds that the sale of the subject in February 2013 for \$63,600 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 February 2013 is a compulsory sale, in the form of a foreclosure, based on the appellants admission in Section IV – Recent Sale Data of the Board’s residential appeal form, the printout from the MLS submitted by the appellant, and the printout from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds’ website, the *lis pendens*, the judicial sale deed, the special warranty deed, and the Real Property Transfer Tax Declaration, all of which was submitted by the board of review.

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 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. However, the Board finds that there is no evidence in the record to contradict the fair market value of the subject's sale price except for two comparable sales submitted by the board of review. The Board finds that it cannot accurately set a range to find that the sale of the subject was not at its fair market value. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)(4) (“Proof of the market value of the subject property may consist of the following: (4) documentation of *not fewer than three recent sales of suggested comparable properties* together with documentation of the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the sales comparables to the subject property.”) (emphasis added).

Therefore, the Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the purchase of the subject property in February 2013 for a price of \$63,600. In support of the transaction, the appellant submitted the printout from the MLS. The Board finds the purchase price is below the market value reflected by the assessment. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$63,600 as of January 1, 2013. Since market value has been determined the 2013 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.00% under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance shall apply. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2).

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: December 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 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.