



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

APPELLANT: Mo & Maryam Riahi
DOCKET NO.: 24-02223.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 13-03-101-003

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Mo & Maryam Riahi, the appellants, by attorney Andrew J. Rukavina, of The Tax Appeal Company in Mundelein; and the Lake County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented in this matter, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds **A Reduction** in the assessment of the property as established by the **Lake** County Board of Review is warranted. The correct assessed valuation of the property is:

LAND: \$38,628
IMPR.: \$344,667
TOTAL: \$383,295

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

Statement of Jurisdiction

The appellants timely filed the appeal from a decision of the Lake County Board of Review pursuant to section 16-160 of the Property Tax Code (35 ILCS 200/16-160) challenging the assessment for the 2024 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 2-story dwelling of brick exterior construction with approximately 7,823 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1995 and is approximately 29 years old. Features of the home include a full basement that is partially finished, central air conditioning, four fireplaces and a 4-car garage containing 1,034 square feet of building area. The property has an approximately 40,903 square foot site located in Lake Barrington, Cuba Township, Lake County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument the appellant submitted an appraisal estimating the subject property had a market value of \$1,150,000 as of January 1, 2024. The appraisal was prepared by Steven L. Smith, a Certified Residential Real Estate Appraiser. The appraiser considered the subject property to be in average condition with dated kitchen and baths. The appraiser also considered the subject property to be

an over improvement for the neighborhood due to its dwelling size. In estimating the market value of the subject property, the appraiser developed the sales comparison approach to value.

Under the sales comparison approach to value, the appraiser used four comparables sales located within .24 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 44,849 to 92,783 square feet of land area that are improved with 2-story dwellings that ranged in age from 24 to 30 years old and ranged in size from 4,572 to 5,064 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a partial or full finished basement, central air conditioning, one to three fireplaces and a 3-car or a 4-car garage. The comparables sold from April 2023 to September 2024 for prices ranging from \$930,000 to \$1,135,000 or from \$184.85 to \$235.13 per square foot of living area, including land. The appraiser adjusted comparable #3 for sales/financing concessions. After considering other adjustments to the comparables for differences from the subject in location, site size, condition, room/bath count, living area, basement, car storage and other features, the appraiser arrived at an estimated market value of \$1,150,000 as of January 1, 2024.

Based on this evidence the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment to reflect the appraised value.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$406,873. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$1,220,741 or \$156.05 per square foot of living area, land included, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

In response to the appeal the board of review submitted a letter from the Cuba Township Assessor's Office that critiqued the appellant's appraisal noting the appraiser chose comparables that are at least 25% smaller in dwelling size when compared to the subject. The assessor's office further questioned if the appraiser inspected the subject property due to photographs in the appraisal were the same photographs used in the appraisal for the 2019 appeal. Lastly, the assessor's office contends the appraiser should have expanded the geographical area in search of comparables due to the subject's dwelling size.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment the board of review submitted information on five comparable sales located 2.17 to 4.41 miles from the subject. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 53,696 to 153,767 square feet of land area that are improved with 1.5-story or 2-story dwellings that were built from 1991 to 2009 and ranged in size from 5,519 to 7,766 square feet of living area. Each comparable has a basement with finished area, central air conditioning, one to five fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 932 to 1,256 square feet of building area. The comparables sold in January 2023 to July 2024 for prices ranging from \$911,050 to \$1,775,000 or from \$146.99 to \$262.73 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

Conclusion of Law

The appellants contend 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 appellants met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value to be the appraisal submitted by the appellants. The appellants' appraiser utilized the sales comparison approach to value to arrive at an estimated market value of \$1,150,000 as of January 1, 2024. The comparable sales used by the appraiser are similar to the subject in location, age, style, and features. The appellant's appraiser made logical adjustments to the comparables for differences including dwelling size from the subject property. The Board gives less weight to the board of review comparable sales which are located over 2 miles away from the subject whereas the comparables submitted by the appraiser are within .24 of a mile from the subject. In addition, two of the board of review comparables have significantly larger site sizes, one of which is improved with a dwelling that is 14 years newer than the subject. Based on this evidence the Board finds a reduction in the subject's assessment commensurate with the appellant's request is 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: June 16, 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

Mo & Maryam Riahi, by attorney:
Andrew J. Rukavina
The Tax Appeal Company
28643 North Sky Crest Drive
Mundelein, IL 60060

COUNTY

Lake County Board of Review
Lake County Courthouse
18 North County Street, 7th Floor
Waukegan, IL 60085