



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

APPELLANT: Satish Pithadia  
DOCKET NO.: 07-21687.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 09-19-200-048-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Satish Pithadia, the appellant(s), by attorney Julie Realmuto, of McCarthy Duffy of Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, 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:     \$ 6,623**  
**IMPR.:    \$ 22,746**  
**TOTAL:    \$ 29,369**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a one-story dwelling of masonry construction containing 1110 square feet of living area. The dwelling is 56 years old. Features of the home include a partial, unfinished basement and a two-car garage.

The appellant's appeal is based on unequal treatment in the assessment process. The appellant submitted basic assessment information on seven properties but provided sufficiently detailed property characteristics information on only four comparable properties. They were described as one-story frame, masonry or frame and masonry dwellings that range in age from 52 to 54 years old. The comparable dwellings range in size from 1241 to 1361 square feet of living area. All lack basements. The appellant did not include any data concerning garages for the comparables. The comparables have improvement assessments ranging from \$15.36 to \$16.67 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment is \$20.49 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's improvement assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's final assessment was disclosed. The board of review presented descriptions and assessment

information on four comparable properties consisting of one-story masonry dwellings that are 54 or 55 years old. The dwellings range in size from 1003 to 1527 square feet of living area. Features include two-car or two and one-half-car garages. One has a full, finished basement and central air conditioning. These properties have improvement assessments ranging from \$16.98 to \$21.12 per square foot of living area. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board finds that it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal. The Board further finds a reduction in the subject's assessment is not warranted.

The appellant contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of the appeal. Taxpayers who object to an assessment on the basis of lack of uniformity bear the burden of proving the disparity of assessment valuations by clear and convincing evidence. Kankakee County Board of Review v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 131 Ill.2d 1 (1989). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds the appellant's comparables #1, #2 and #3 should be given reduced weight in the Board's analysis because they were of different exterior construction than the subject. The Board also finds the board of review's comparable #3 should be given less weight because it is much larger than the subject. The Board finds the remaining four comparables submitted by the parties were most similar to the subject although they lacked basements enjoyed by the subject. Due to their similarities to the subject, these comparables received the most weight in the Board's analysis. These comparables had improvement assessments that ranged from \$16.67 to \$21.12 per square foot of living area. The subject's improvement assessment of \$20.49 per square foot of living area is within the range established by the most similar comparables. After considering adjustments and the differences in both parties' comparables when compared to the subject, the Board finds the subject's improvement assessment is equitable and 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.

*Ronald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*Shawn R. Lerbis*

Member

DISSENTING:

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

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: January 26, 2010

*Allen Castrovillari*

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 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 the subsequent year 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.

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.