



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

APPELLANT: Jorge Lopez
DOCKET NO.: 24-30031.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 16-20-224-030-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Jorge Lopez, the appellant, by attorney Andreas Mamalakis, of the Law Offices of Andreas Mamalakis in Kenosha; 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: \$3,359
IMPR.: \$26,705
TOTAL: \$30,064

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 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 building of masonry exterior construction containing 3,374 square feet of building area. The building is approximately 94 years old. Features of the building include a partial basement and five full bathrooms. The property has an approximately 3,125 square foot site and is located in Cicero, Cicero Township, Cook County. The subject is classified as a class 2-11 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 comparables that are located in the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with class 2-11, 1.5-story or 2-story buildings of masonry exterior construction that range in size from 3,302 to 3,827 square feet of building area. The buildings range in age from 93 to 108 years old. Three comparables each have a full basement and two comparables each have a slab foundation. Each comparable has two or three full

bathrooms, two fireplaces and from a 1.5-car to 2.5-car garage. One comparable has central air conditioning and two-half bathrooms. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$20,671 to \$25,023 or from \$5.88 to \$6.73 per square foot of building area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested the subject's improvement assessment be reduced to \$21,492 or \$6.37 per square foot of building area.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$30,064. The subject property has an improvement assessment of \$26,705 or \$7.91 per square foot of building area. In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on four equity comparables located in the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject property. The comparables are improved with class 2-11, 2-story buildings of masonry exterior construction that range in size from 3,020 to 3,268 square feet of building area. The buildings range in age from 101 to 112 years old. Each comparable has a full basement, three full bathrooms and a 2-car garage. The comparables have improvement assessments that range from \$26,458 to \$28,530 or from \$8.40 to \$9.07 per square foot of building 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 record contains nine suggested equity comparables for the Board's consideration. The Board has given less weight to appellant's comparables #1, #3, #4 and #5 as well as board of review comparable #2 due to their differences from the subject in building size, design and/or foundation style.

The Board finds the best evidence of assessment equity to be appellant's comparable #2 along with board of review comparables #1, #3 and #4. The Board finds that these comparables are most similar to the subject in design, age, foundation, building size and some features. However, each comparable has fewer bathrooms and each has a garage, an amenity the subject lacks, suggesting adjustments would be required to make the comparables more equivalent to the subject. Nevertheless, these most similar comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$20,671 to \$28,530 or from \$6.26 to \$8.73 per square foot of building area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$26,705 or \$7.91 per square foot of building area falls within the range of the best comparables in this record. Based on this record and after considering adjustments to the best comparables for differences from the subject, 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 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

Jorge Lopez, by attorney:
Andreas Mamalakis
Law Offices of Andreas Mamalakis
4844 89th Place
Kenosha, WI 53142

COUNTY

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