



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

APPELLANT: Ihor Shvetson
DOCKET NO.: 14-28452.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 12-29-209-020-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Ihor Shvetson, the appellant(s), by attorney Joanne Elliott, of Elliott & Associates, P.C. in Des Plaines; 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: \$3,625
IMPR.: \$18,113
TOTAL: \$21,738

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 52 year-old, two-story dwelling of masonry construction containing 2,250 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a partial unfinished basement and a two and one-half-car garage. The property has a 5,000 square foot site and is located in Leyden Township, Cook County. The property is a Class 2 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 Federal National Mortgage Association (hereinafter, "Fannie Mae") on June 21, 2013 for a price of \$121,000 in an all-cash transaction. The appellant also submitted: 1) a Multiple Listing Service (hereinafter, "MLS") information sheet disclosing the subject was offered for sale as "REO/Lender Owned, Pre-Foreclosure" property; 2) an Affidavit of the appellant; 3) a real estate

contract disclosing the seller acquired the subject by foreclosure and that the purchaser would agree to various restrictions and prohibitions against conveying or encumbering the subject for three months from the date of purchase; and 4) 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 bank sale. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the purchase price when using 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 \$21,738. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$217,380 or \$96.61 per square foot of living area when using the 2014 level of assessment of 10.00% for Class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. The subject's sale price of \$121,000 reflects a market value of \$53.78 per square foot of living area including land. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four suggested comparable sales and on the June 2013 sale of the subject for the price of \$121,000.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the comparables submitted as evidence by the board of review should be given diminished weight because they were dissimilar to the subject in various key property characteristics. The appellant reaffirmed the request for an assessment reduction.

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 June 2013 for \$121,000 is 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.

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)).

The real estate contract, MLS information sheet, and Section IV information submitted by the appellant disclosed the subject's sale was compulsory. The real estate contract disclosed the purchaser, the appellant herein, agreed to various restrictions and prohibitions against conveying or encumbering the subject for three months from the date of purchase. The appellant's attestation that the transaction was at arm's-length lacks the foundation to establish his qualifications to make that legal conclusion. 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 compulsory and did not submit sale comparables to show that the sale of the subject in June 2013 for \$121,000 was at its fair cash value. Moreover, the board of review submitted sale comparables that contained property characteristics similar to the subject's and sold for prices ranging from \$98.17 to \$137.80 per square foot of living area including land. These sales occurred from September 2013 through December 2013 and were closer to the tax lien date than the subject's sale in June 2013. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$96.61 per square foot of living area including land, which is below the range established by the best comparable sales in this record. The board of review's sale comparables also establish that the subject's purchase price was below its fair cash value. Since there is no supporting evidence that the sale price of the subject was at its fair cash value, and after considering all the evidence in light of various relevant factors, the Board finds that the subject is not overvalued and holds that a reduction is not warranted.

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.