



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

APPELLANT: Kunyuan Mao Trust  
DOCKET NO.: 14-27610.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 20-14-202-076-1501

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Kunyuan Mao Trust, 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 **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:** \$1,149  
**IMPR.:** \$5,699  
**TOTAL:** \$6,848

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 2014 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 is a residential condominium unit contained in a 47 year-old, 540-unit residential condominium development. The property has a 244,546 square foot site and is located in Hyde 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 a settlement statement disclosing the subject property was purchased from The Secretary of Veterans Affairs on October 31, 2013 for a price of \$53,428.57 in an all cash transaction. The appellant also submitted a Multiple Listing Service listing sheet disclosing the subject was sold as "REO/Lender Owned" property in an "as-is" condition; and information in Section IV—Recent Sale Data of the Residential Appeal that the subject was not sold as a transfer between related parties, was advertised and sold through a realtor, and was sold in settlement of a foreclosure. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's

assessment to reflect the purchase price when applying the 2014 level of assessment of 10.00% for Class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$6,847. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$68,470 when applying the 2014 level of assessment of 10.00% for Class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted a condominium analysis with information on suggested comparable sales for 28 units in the development that sold from 2011 through 2014 for a sales total of \$2,311,800. The board of review applied a 1.00% market value reduction to the subject for personal property without further evidence to arrive at an adjusted market value of \$2,288,682 of the 28 units sold. The board of review disclosed the units sold consisted of 5.5831% of all units in the building. The result was a full value of the property at \$40,993,033. Since the subject was 0.1741% of all the units, the board of review suggested the market value of the subject to be \$71,369.

### **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 has not met 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 2013 for \$53,428.57 is a "compulsory sale." The appellant's evidence disclosed the subject's sale was compulsory. 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.

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., 961 N.E. 2d 794, 802 (2d Dist. 2011) (citing Chrysler Corp. v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 69 Ill. App. 3d 207, 211 (2d Dist. 1979)).

However, when there was a recent sale of the subject, and that sale was compulsory, 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 appellant's evidence did not dispute that the sale was a compulsory sale. The appellant did not submit sale comparables to show that the sale of the subject in October 2013 for \$53,428.57 was at its fair cash value. Moreover, the board of review submitted sale comparables in the building that contained property characteristics similar to the subject's and sold from 2011 through 2014 for prices ranging from \$51,500 to \$131,000. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$68,480, which is within the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. Since there is no supporting evidence that the sale price of the subject was at its fair cash value, the Board finds that the subject is not overvalued and holds that 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.



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: January 27, 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.