



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

APPELLANT: Shahzaib & Elizabeth Kurshy
DOCKET NO.: 25-01000.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 11-17-402-014

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Shahzaib & Elizabeth Kurshy, 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 **no change** 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: \$108,833
IMPR.: \$115,485
TOTAL: \$224,318

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 2025 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 brick exterior construction with 2,366 square feet of living area. The dwelling was constructed in 1977. Features of the property include a basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace and a garage with 420 square feet of building area. The property has a 21,806 square foot site and is located in Libertyville, Libertyville Township, Lake County.

The appellants contend overvaluation as the basis of the appeal. In support of this argument, the appellants submitted information on three comparable sales that have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject and are located within approximately .24 of a mile from the subject property. The comparables have sites that range in size from 16,375 to 24,095 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with two-story dwellings of brick and frame exterior construction ranging in size from 2,603 to 4,051 square feet of living area. The dwellings were

built in 1977 and 1978. Two comparables each have a full basement, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 483 to 787 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from June 2022 to October 2024 for prices ranging from \$560,000 to \$1,075,000 or from \$215.14 to \$265.37 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the appellants requested the subject's total assessment be reduced to \$203,030, which would reflect a market value of \$609,151 or \$257.46 per square foot of living area, including land, when using the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" disclosing the total assessment for the subject of \$224,318. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$673,021 or \$284.46 per square foot of living area, land included, when applying the statutory level of assessment of 33.33%.

In support of its contention of the correct assessment, the board of review submitted information on three comparable sales that have the same assessment neighborhood code as the subject and are located within approximately .09 of a mile from the subject property. The board of review's comparable #3 is the same property as the appellants' comparable #3. The comparables have sites that range in size from 15,061 to 24,095 square feet of land area. The comparables are improved with one-story or two-story dwellings of frame, brick or brick and frame exterior construction ranging in size from 2,536 to 4,051 square feet of living area. The dwellings were each built in 1978. Each comparable has a basement, central air conditioning, one or two fireplaces and a garage ranging in size from 431 to 787 square feet of building area. The comparables sold from March 2023 to October 2024 for prices ranging from \$770,000 to \$1,075,000 or from \$265.37 to \$333.23 per square foot of living area, including land. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellants' counsel asserted that the county's comparable #1 was rehabbed in 2010 and is a cape cod design; the county's comparable #2 is a one-story ranch, not a traditional two-story design, like the subject; and the county's comparable #3 sold for \$265.37 per square foot of living area, including land, which is well below the subject's value of \$284.46 per square foot of living area, including land.

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 did not meet this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The record contains five suggested comparable sales for the Board's consideration, as one sale was common to both parties. The Board finds neither party submitted comparables that were truly similar to the subject due to significant differences in dwelling size and/or design and/or their sale dates occurred in 2022 or 2023, less proximate to the lien date at issue than other sales in the record. Nevertheless, the Board has given less weight to the appellants' comparables #1

and #2, as well as board of review comparable #1 due to their sale dates occurring from 21 to 31 months prior to the January 1, 2025 assessment date.

The Board has given more weight to the appellants' comparable #3, along with board of review comparables #2 and #3, which includes the parties' common comparable. The Board finds these two comparables sold most proximate to the January 1, 2025 assessment date and are located in close proximity to the subject. However, the Board finds the parties' common comparable is most similar to the subject in site size but has a substantially larger dwelling size and a larger garage, when compared to the subject. The Board finds board of review comparable #2 is most similar to the subject in dwelling size, but this comparable has a smaller site size, a substantially larger basement area and the dwelling is a one-story design, when compared to the subject's two-story design. These differences suggest adjustments would be required to make these comparables more equivalent to the subject. Nevertheless, these two comparables sold in February and October 2024 for prices of \$770,000 and \$1,075,000 or for \$265.37 and \$303.63 per square foot of living area, including land. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$673,021 or \$284.46 per square foot of living area, including land, which falls well below the two best comparable sales in this record in terms of overall value and is bracketed by the comparables on a price per square foot of living area, including land basis. Based on this record and after considering adjustments to the best comparable sales for differences when compared to the subject, the Board finds a reduction in the subject's estimated market value as reflected by its 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: _____

October 20, 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 9-215 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

Shahzaib & Elizabeth Kurshy, 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