



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

APPELLANT: Syed Ali  
DOCKET NO.: 18-25312.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 11-31-302-091-1004

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Syed Ali, the appellant(s), by attorney Christopher G. Walsh, Jr., Attorney at Law 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 **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:** \$ 2,691  
**IMPR.:** \$ 11,579  
**TOTAL:** \$ 14,270

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 2018 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 25.00% ownership interest in the common elements. The property is located in Rogers Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. No evidence was submitted as to whether the subject is owner-occupied.

The appellant contends overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted evidence that the subject was purchased on April 30, 2015 for \$80,000. In Section IV of the appeal form, the appellant stated that the subject was sold pursuant to a foreclosure. The settlement statement submitted by the appellant lists TCF National Bank as the

seller. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested that the subject's assessment be reduced to \$13,130.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$14,270. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$142,700 when applying the 2018 statutory level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance of 10.00%.

In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review stated that the subject was purchased on October 31, 2018 for \$142,700. No evidence was submitted in support of this recent sale. The board of review's evidence also states: "No [r]ecent sales in the building – Subject was a [f]oreclosure sale not a fair market transaction. [I]t was listed for 1 day. [S]ales on the same street have ranged from \$90,000-\$123,000."

### **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 April 2015 for a price of \$80,000 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 April 2015 is a compulsory sale, in the form of a foreclosure, based on Section IV of the appeal form submitted by the appellant, which states that the sale was pursuant to a foreclosure, and also based on the settlement statement submitted by the appellant, which states that the seller was a financial institution. See id.

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.

Reading section 1-23 in conjunction with the above cited caselaw shows that the sale of the subject in April 2015 for a price of \$80,000 was not an arm’s-length transaction. For a recent sale to be considered arm’s-length, neither party must be under compulsion to either buy or sell the property. As the Board has found that the sale of the subject was a *compulsory* sale, it logically follows that the seller was under *compulsion* to sell the property. Therefore, this sale was not an arm’s-length transaction, and has been given no weight in the Board’s analysis. The appellant did not submit any further evidence as to the subject’s market value. Therefore, the Board finds that the appellant has not proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the subject is overvalued, and that 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:

April 19, 2022



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

Syed Ali, by attorney:  
Christopher G. Walsh, Jr.  
Walsh Law, LLC  
111 West Washington Street  
Suite 1150  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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