



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

APPELLANT: Daniel Riley
DOCKET NO.: 18-21738.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 23-33-200-037-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Daniel Riley, the appellant(s), by attorney Jessica Hill-Magiera, Attorney at Law in Lake Zurich; 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: \$ 2,929
IMPR.: \$ 34,639
TOTAL: \$ 37,568

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellant timely filed the appeal pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) after receiving a decision from the Cook County Board of Review. The instant appeal challenges the assessment for tax year 2018. The Property Tax Appeal Board (the "Board") finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.

Findings of Fact

The subject consists of a one-story dwelling of frame and masonry construction with 2,558 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 16 years old. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a two-car garage. The property's site is 4,687 square feet, and it is located in Palos Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-95 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 March 16, 2017 for a price of \$300,000, or \$117.28 per square foot of living area, including land. The PTAX-203 form submitted by the appellant states that the subject is the appellant's principal residence, and, therefore, it is owner-occupied. The PTAX-203 form submitted by the appellant

states that the sale of subject was an REO sale. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to \$30,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing that the total assessment for the subject is \$37,568. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$375,680, or \$146.86 per square foot of living area, including land, when applying the 2018 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.00% 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 eight equity comparables, and four sale comparables. These sale comparables sold from June 2016 to April 2018 for \$330,000 to \$390,000, or \$147.06 to \$162.66 per square foot of living area, including land. The board of review's evidence also states that the subject was purchased in March 2017 for \$300,000.

In rebuttal, the appellant argued that the board of review's sale comparables were not relevant, as the appellant's appeal is based on a recent sale of the subject, and not sale comparables. The appellant also argues that Calumet Transfer LLC v. Property Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill.App.3d 652 (1st Dist. 2010) is distinguishable from the instant appeal, as the parties in that appeal included evidence of a recent sale of the subject and an appraisal, whereas the instant appeal only includes evidence of the former.

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 proven 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.

The Board finds that the sale of the subject in March 2017 for a price of \$300,000 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. The Board finds that the sale of the subject in March 2017 for a price of \$300,000 is a compulsory sale, in the form of a foreclosure, based on the PTAX-203 form submitted by the appellant, which states that the sale of the subject was an REO sale.

Finding that the sale of the subject was a compulsory sale, the question then becomes whether the compulsory sale of the subject is an arm's-length transaction such that the sale price reflects

the subject's fair cash value. Indeed, "a contemporaneous sale between parties dealing at arm's-length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash market value, [citations] but would be practically conclusive on the issue of whether an assessment was at full value." People ex rel. Korzen v. Belt Ry. Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158, 161 (1967). However, "[i]n order for the sale price of property to be used as the market value, the transaction must be between a willing buyer and a willing seller, neither of whom are under compulsion to buy or sell, and no account should be taken of values or necessities peculiar to either party." Id. at 164 (citing City of Chicago v. Harrison-Halsted Building Corp., 11 Ill.2d 431 (1957); Ligare v. Chicago, Madison and Northern Railroad Co., 166 Ill. 249 (1897); and City of Chicago v. Farwell, 286 Ill. 415 (1918), overruled on other grounds by Forest Preserve Dist. of Du Page County v. First Nat. Bank of Franklin Park, 2011 IL 110759). The appellant asserts that the sale of the subject was an arm's-length transaction, while the board of review contends that it is not.

In Calumet Transfer, the court upheld the Board's decision, wherein the Board allowed the intervenor to challenge the arm's-length nature of the sale of the property, through the submission of sale comparables, pursuant to Section 1910.65(c)(4) of the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Calumet Transfer, 401 Ill.App.3d at 655-56; 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c)(4) ("[p]roof 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."). Like the board of review here, the intervenor in Calumet Transfer argued that the seller was under duress to sell the property, and, therefore, the purchase price was below fair market value as evidenced by the comparable sales. Id. at 656. The court stated that, "There is no provision in the Property Tax Code that restricts [the Board's] authority to consider such evidence. To the contrary, paragraph (4) of section 1910.65(c) specifically allows evidence of comparable property sales to prove fair market value." Id.

In rebuttal, the appellant attempts to distinguish Calumet Transfer from the instant appeal based on the evidence submitted by the parties. The Board is not persuaded. The appellant appears to be drawing a distinction between the types of evidence a party can use to prove a property's fair market value. For example, in rebuttal, the appellant argues that, since the appellant's appeal is based on a recent sale of the subject, the Board cannot use sale comparables submitted by the board of review to prove the subject's fair market value. The Board finds such an argument reads the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board too narrowly. Section 1910.65(c) of the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board lists four types of evidence that a party may submit to prove a property's fair market value: 1) an appraisal; 2) documentation of a recent sale; 3) documentation of constructions costs; or 4) documentation of sale comparables. All four types of evidence can be used to prove a property's fair market value; and as the court stated in Calumet Transfer, a party is not foreclosed from submitting one type of evidence to prove fair market value based on the evidence submitted by another party. By submitting evidence of a recent sale, and arguing that such a sale proves that a property is overvalued, the appellant puts the question of the property's fair market value before the Board. Adverse parties, such as the board of review, are allowed to submit their own evidence of the property's fair market value as well. That is what the parties did in Calumet Transfer (which the appellate court expressly allowed), and that is what the parties did here. As such, the Board finds no distinction between the instant appeal and Calumet Transfer insofar as it relates to the appellate court's interpretation

of Section 1910.65(c) of the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board. In short, if the appellant submits evidence of a recent sale of the subject to prove the property's fair market value, then an adverse party is allowed to submit evidence of the subject's fair market value in any way it sees fit, including the submission of sale comparables.

In looking at the sale comparables submitted by the parties, the Board finds all of the board of review's sale comparables to be most similar to the subject. These sale comparables sold for prices ranging from \$147.06 to \$162.66 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's sale price reflects a market value of \$117.28 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the range established by the best comparables in this record. Therefore, the Board finds that the compulsory sale of the subject in March 2017 for a price of \$300,000 was below the subject's fair market value, and, therefore, was not an arm's-length transaction. As such, this sale has been given no weight in the Board's analysis. Additionally, the subject's current assessment reflects a market value of \$146.86 per square foot of living area, including land, which is below the range established by the most similar sale comparables in the record. Since there is no other market value evidence proffered by the appellant, the Board finds that the appellant has not proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the subject is 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. Pursuant to Section 1910.50(d) of the rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(d)) the proceeding before the Property Tax Appeal Board is terminated when the decision is rendered. The Property Tax Appeal Board does not require any motion or request for reconsideration.



Chairman



Member



Member



Member



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:

October 19, 2021



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 or years of the same general assessment period, as provided in Sections 9-125 through 9-225, 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 such subsequent year or years 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 OR YEARS. A separate petition and evidence must be filed for each of the remaining years of the general assessment period.

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.

PARTIES OF RECORD

AGENCY

State of Illinois
Property Tax Appeal Board
William G. Stratton Building, Room 402
401 South Spring Street
Springfield, IL 62706-4001

APPELLANT

Daniel Riley, by attorney:
Jessica Hill-Magiera
Attorney at Law
790 Harvest Drive
Lake Zurich, IL 60047

COUNTY

Cook County Board of Review
County Building, Room 601
118 North Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60602