



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

APPELLANT: Suresh C Mehta  
DOCKET NO.: 23-23381.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 27-23-315-033-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Suresh C Mehta, the appellant(s), by attorney Brian P. Liston, of the Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C. 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:** \$4,901  
**IMPR.:** \$27,099  
**TOTAL:** \$32,000

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 2023 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 split-level single-family dwelling of frame and masonry construction with 1,396 square feet of living area. The dwelling was 38 years old. Features of the home include a partial basement, central air conditioning, and a two-car garage. The property has a 7,540 square foot site and is located in Tinley Park, Orland Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-34 property under the Cook County Real Property Assessment Classification Ordinance.

The appellant contends assessment inequity as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted information on three class 2-34 equity comparable properties with varying degrees of similarities to the subject which are located within a 0.1-mile radius of the subject. The improvements ranged: in age from 40 to 45 years; in size from 1,325 to 1,727 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessment from \$17.82 to \$19.01 per square foot

of living area. Appellant disclosed that this is an owner-occupied residence. Based on this evidence the appellant is seeking a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$32,000. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$27,099 or \$19.41 per square foot of living area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on four class 2-34 equity comparable properties with varying degrees of similarities to the subject which are located within a ¼-mile radius of the subject. The improvements were 45 or 47 years old, had from 1,325 to 1,370 square feet of living area, and had improvement assessments from \$20.62 to \$21.91 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 seven equity comparable properties for the Board's consideration in determining assessment equity. The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparables #1, #2, and #3 and board of review's comparables #1, #2, and #3. Appellant's comparables #1, #2, and #3 were similar to the subject in age, size, and partial basement. One of these comparables had the same number of bathrooms as the subject while the others had one half-bathroom fewer or one full bathroom more than the subject. Two of these comparables had central air conditioning like the subject while the other did not. Two of these comparables had a two-car garage like the subject while the other had a 2.5-car garage. Board of review's comparables #1, #2, and #3 were similar to the subject in age, size, partial basement, and two-car garage. These comparables had one half bathroom more than the subject. One of these comparables had central air conditioning like the subject while the others did not. These comparable properties were similar to the subject and had improvement assessments that ranged from \$17.82 to \$21.61 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$19.41 per square foot of living area falls within the range established by the best comparable properties in this record. Based on this record the Board finds the appellant did not demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence that the subject's improvement was inequitably assessed and 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 19, 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

Suresh C Mehta, by attorney:  
Brian P. Liston  
Law Offices of Liston & Tsantilis, P.C.  
200 S. Wacker Drive  
Suite 820  
Chicago, IL 60606

COUNTY

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