



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

APPELLANT: Ameed Mallick  
DOCKET NO.: 13-31421.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 14-32-410-069-1003

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ameed Mallick, the appellant(s), by attorney Abby L. Strauss, of Schiller Strauss & Lavin PC 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 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:** \$ 7,178  
**IMPR.:** \$ 37,272  
**TOTAL:** \$ 44,450

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 36.00% ownership interest in the common elements. The property is located in Chicago, North Chicago 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 July 10, 2012 for a price of \$444,500. 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 \$51,541. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$515,410 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 one unit in the subject's building plus the subject, or 78.4% of ownership, sold in 2006 and 2012, respectively, for an aggregate price of \$1,619,500. An allocation of 25.00% for personal property was subtracted from the sales price, and then divided by the percentage of interest of the units sold to arrive at a total market value for the building of \$1,549,267.

### **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 the best evidence of market value to be the undisputed purchase of the subject property in July 2012 for a price of \$444,500. The appellant provided evidence demonstrating the sale had the elements of an arm's length transaction, including disclosing that the parties to the transaction were not related, that the subject was sold using a Realtor, and that property had been advertised for sale on the open market with a listing on the MLS. In further support of the transaction, the appellant submitted the settlement statement and the purchase and sale agreement. The Board finds the purchase price is below the market value reflected by the assessment. The Board finds the board of review did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction or to refute the contention that the purchase price was reflective of market value. Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$444,500 as of January 1, 2013. Since market value has been determined the 2013 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10.00% shall apply.

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



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: August 19, 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.