



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

APPELLANT: Anthony C Eheli  
DOCKET NO.: 21-38172.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 20-11-307-021-1007

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Anthony C Eheli, 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:** \$3,270  
**IMPR.:** \$15,729  
**TOTAL:** \$18,999

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 one condominium unit within a seven-unit, approximately 102-year-old condominium building. The subject property has 10.00% ownership of the common space of the building. The property is located on a 6,539 square foot site and is located in Chicago, Hyde Park Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-99 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. There is conflicting evidence submitted as to the size of the subject property condominium unit.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Neither party submitted documentation establishing the subject property's square footage in their written filings. The record contains conflicting information: the MLS listing reports the subject as containing 1,740 square feet, while the Illinois Real Estate Transfer Declaration (PTAX-203) reflects 2,200 square feet. Given this inconsistency and the absence of competent evidence resolving the discrepancy, the Board is unable to make a definitive finding regarding the subject's square footage.

The appellant appeal is based on overvaluation under the theory of a recent sale. In support of this argument the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased in June of 2020, for a price of \$133,200. Based on the submitted evidence, the price per square foot of living space cannot be determined. The appellant submitted a settlement statement, a Multiple Listing Service (MLS) data closing sheet, an unsigned Illinois Real Estate Transfer Declaration (PTAX-203), information on five comparable sales<sup>2</sup>, and the appellant answered some of the questions in Section IV of the residential appeal. The answers showed that the sale used an unnamed realtor and was not between family members or related corporations. The method of advertisement was listed as through the MLS. The appellant did not answer the question of how long a period the subject property was advertised for. The appellant also failed to answer the question of whether the property was sold due to a foreclosure action. The MLS closing sheet however did indicate that the property was sold “as-is” due to a foreclosure action. The seller of the property was listed as Towd Point Mortgage Trust 2017-1, U.S. Bank National Association. The MLS closing sheet also indicated that the buyer is responsible for six months of past due assessments, attorney’s fees, and special assessments.

The appellant also contends overvaluation under the theory of comparable sales. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on five comparable sales. The comparable properties sold between February 2020 and November 2021. The comparables were located between 0.06 and 0.68 miles of the subject property. The comparable properties ranged: in price between \$88,000 to \$141,750. The appellant lists on “2021 Property Tax Analysis” page that each of these comparables are residential condominiums; however, the record is silent as to the size of the comparable properties, the characteristics of the individual units such as the number of bedrooms or number of bathrooms, or any common element amenities.

The appellant submitted a brief in support of these arguments and requested the subject’s total assessment be reduced to \$13,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$18,999. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$189,990 when using the 10% level of assessments 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 information on comparable sales utilizing a condominium analysis consisting of three sales of condominium units from the subject property. Those sales were as follows: PIN 20-11-307-021-1004 sold in January of 2021 for \$305,000 and consisted of 15.00% of ownership, PIN 20-11-307-021-1005 sold in July of 2018 for \$285,000 and consisted of 15.00% of ownership, and PIN 20-11-307-021-1006 sold in July of 2019 for \$276,000 and consisted of 15.00% of ownership.

The board of review’s condominium analysis proceeded as follows. The board of review added the sales figures from the sales of the three PINs to reach a total sales amount of \$866,000. The board of review then divided that figure by the total amount of ownership of the sold PINs (45.00%) to reach an estimated fair market value of the entire building of \$1,924,444. The board

---

<sup>2</sup> These five sales comparables were submitted as support of the recent sale price being reflective of market value and also submitted to show overvaluation based on the comparable sales alone.

of review then multiplied that by the percentage of interest for the instant PINs under appeal using 10% as the subject property holds 10% interest in the common elements. The board of review then applied a 10% level of assessment for class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance to reach a total assessed value of \$19,244. The board of review requested that the assessment be confirmed.

In rebuttal, the appellant submitted a letter containing argument that the sale price was indicative of market value and that their submitted comparable sales is further support of the sale price being market value. The appellant reaffirmed their 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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The Board's responsibility in this matter is to determine the correct assessment of the subject property. See 35 ILCS 200/16-180. The appellant sought to establish that the subject's market value was lower than the value implied by its assessed valuation, relying on two forms of evidence: the recent sale of the subject property and the sales of purportedly comparable properties.

### Recent Sale

Under Illinois law, real property must be valued at its fair cash value, meaning the price that would be paid for it at a fair, voluntary sale where the buyer and the seller are both ready, willing, and able to buy and sell, but neither is compelled to do so. Bd of Educ of Meridian Community School Dist. No. 223 v. Ill. Property Tax Appeal Bd., 2011 IL App (2d) 100068, ¶ 36. Ordinarily, a contemporaneous sale of the subject property between sale of the subject property between parties dealing at arms-length is practically conclusive on the issue of whether as assessment reflected the fair cash market value of the property. Gateway-Walden, LLC v. Pappas, 2018 IL App (1<sup>st</sup>) 162714, ¶ 33.

The Board finds that the sale of the subject in June of 2020 for \$133,200 was 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.

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., 2012 IL App (2d) 100068, ¶ 36 (citing Chrysler Corp. v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 69 Ill.App.3d 207, 211 (2d Dist. 1979)).

While the sale of a residence from an indentured trustee is not necessarily a compulsory sale, this fact combined with the appellant's failure to affirmatively answer that the property was not sold due to a foreclosure action makes it difficult to make a determination on the nature of the sale and the Board is not able to find that the sale of the subject property was an arm's-length sale. .

A sale that is not an arm's-length sale may still be reflective of a fair market value. The Board may look at the market value evidence submitted by the parties to determine whether the purchase price was at the subject's fair market value. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c). Such evidence may consist of an appraisal or the sales of comparable properties. 86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.65(c); see, Calumet Transfer, LLC v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill.App.3d 652, 655-56 (1st Dist. 2010) (“[The Board] allowed the [intervenor] to challenge the arm's-length nature of the transaction by offering evidence of comparable property sales. This was permissible under paragraph (4) of section 1910.65(c).”)

In determining the market value of the subject, the Board looks to the market value evidence submitted by the parties to determine whether the purchase price was at the subject's fair market value.

The appellant submitted five comparable sales as support that the sale price was reflective of market value. The Board gives very little weight to these comparable sales. As note, there was a dearth of information concerning the comparable sales to property analyze whether they were truly comparable to the subject property. The Board is not given points of comparison such as living size, number of bedrooms and bathrooms, and other amenities. Since these sales are from another building, the Board cannot make assumptions surrounding comparable size or amenities that could otherwise be made based off of comparisons of ownership interests from within the same building.

The Board finds that the evidence submitted by the appellant is inconclusive regarding the nature of the subject property's sale. The record does not establish whether the transaction was voluntary, arm's-length, or compulsory. In the absence of competent evidence clarifying the character of the sale, the Board cannot rely on the reported sale as an indicator of fair market value. Accordingly, the appellant has not met the burden to establish market value by a preponderance of the evidence through the recent sale, and a reduction on this basis is not warranted.

Comparable Sales

The Illinois Condominium Property Act states that “Real property taxes . . . which are authorized by law to be assessed against and levied upon real property shall be assessed against and levied upon each unit and the owner’s corresponding percentage of ownership in the common elements as a tract, and not upon the property as a whole.” 765 ILCS 605/10(a).

The Board finds the board of review’s condominium analysis to be the most credible evidence of the subject property’s market value. As previously explained, the appellant’s comparable sales are afforded minimal weight because the appellant submitted only limited information regarding the purported comparables. The record contains no competent or reliable documentation establishing the size of the comparable units, their physical characteristics—such as the number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms, or the presence of common-element amenities—or the subject property’s total square footage. These omissions significantly impair the Board’s ability to conduct a complete and competent valuation analysis. In contrast, the board of review’s analysis—derived from condominium sales within the same building as the subject property—provides sufficiently reliable data from which to determine market value. That analysis indicates a market value of \$192,444 for the subject, which exceeds the market value implied by the subject’s assessed valuation when applying the 10 percent level of assessment for Class 2 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance. Based on this evidence, the Board finds 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 21, 2026



\_\_\_\_\_  
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

Anthony C Eheli, 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