



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

APPELLANT: Rajesh Karmacharya  
DOCKET NO.: 21-30628.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-36-421-002-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Rajesh Karmacharya, the appellant, by attorney Ciarra Schmidt of Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd. 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:** \$14,062  
**IMPR.:** \$58,663  
**TOTAL:** \$72,725

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 2021 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 consists of a two-story dwelling of frame and masonry exterior construction with 2,296 square feet of living area. The dwelling is approximately 19 years old. The home features a full basement that is finished with a formal recreation room,<sup>1</sup> three full bathrooms, one half bathroom, central air conditioning, two fireplaces and a 2-car garage. The property has a 3,125 square foot site and is located in Chicago, West Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-78 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity with respect to the improvement as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on five equity

---

<sup>1</sup> The board of review disclosed the subject dwelling has a full basement finished with a formal recreation room and an additional half bathroom, which were not refuted by the appellant.

comparables that have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject, one of which is located along the same street as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of frame, masonry or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,092 to 2,520 square feet of living area. The dwellings are from 0 to 19 years old. According to the property detail printouts provided by the appellant, each comparable has a full basement, two of which are finished with a recreation room. Each comparable has central air conditioning and two or three full bathrooms. One comparable has an additional half bathroom, four comparables each have a fireplace and four comparables each have a 3-car or a 3.5-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$42,143 to \$51,986 or from \$17.40 to \$20.97 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$47,366 or \$20.63 per square foot of living area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$72,725. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$58,663 or \$25.55 per square foot of living area.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables that have the same assessment neighborhood code and property classification code as the subject. The comparables are located within the same block and along the same street as the subject property. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of frame or frame and masonry exterior construction ranging in size from 2,265 to 2,304 square feet of living area. The dwellings are from 10 to 22 years old. The comparables each have a full basement that is finished with a formal recreation room, central air conditioning, two or three full bathrooms, one half bathroom, one or two fireplaces and a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments of \$58,937 and \$71,937 or from \$25.87 to \$31.22 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

### **Conclusion of Law**

The taxpayer contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. When unequal treatment in the assessment process is the basis of the appeal, the inequity of the assessments must be proved by clear and convincing evidence. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.63(e). Proof of unequal treatment in the assessment process should consist of documentation of the assessments for the assessment year in question of not less than three comparable properties showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(b). The Board finds the appellant did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The parties submitted nine comparable properties for the Board's consideration. The Board has given less weight to the appellant's comparables #1, #2, #4 and #5 which differ from the subject dwelling in age and/or lack of basement finish. Additionally, the appellant's comparable #2 has no garage, a feature of the subject.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be the appellant's comparable #3, along with the four comparables submitted by the board of review, which are similar to the

subject in location and overall, most similar to the subject dwelling in size, design, age and most features. These five comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$51,986 to \$71,937 or from \$20.63 to \$31.22 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$58,663 or \$25.55 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparables in the record. After considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed.

The constitutional provision for uniformity of taxation and valuation does not require mathematical equality. A practical uniformity, rather than an absolute one, is the test. Apex Motor Fuel Co. v. Barrett, 20 Ill.2d 395 (1960). Although the comparables presented by the parties disclosed that properties located in the same area are not assessed at identical levels, all that the constitution requires is a practical uniformity, which appears to exist on the basis of the evidence presented.

Based on this record, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not justified.

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:

May 20, 2025



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

Rajesh Karmacharya, by attorney:  
Ciarra Schmidt  
Schmidt Salzman & Moran, Ltd.  
111 W. Washington St.  
Suite 1300  
Chicago, IL 60602

COUNTY

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