



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

APPELLANT: Steven Pinsler  
DOCKET NO.: 07-22455.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 10-21-405-077-1115

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Steven Pinsler, the appellant(s), by attorney Arnold G. Siegel, of Siegel & Callahan, P.C. in Chicago; and the Cook County Board of Review.

Based on the facts and exhibits presented, the Property Tax Appeal Board hereby finds a reduction 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:** \$ 4,191  
**IMPR.:** \$44,503  
**TOTAL:** \$48,694

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a class 2-99 residential condominium unit with a percentage of ownership of 1.0911%, and is located in Niles Township, Cook County. The appellant argued that the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed value.

In support of the overvaluation argument the appellant, via counsel, submitted a settlement statement showing that the subject sold on December 30, 2005 for \$485,000. The appellant also submitted a sales contract dated August 25, 2005, which states that the sale price of the subject was \$475,000. A warranty deed was also submitted, which contains State of Illinois Real Estate Transfer Tax Stamps for \$485.00, and which is dated October 11, 2005. The appellant's pleadings state that the sale was an arm's length transaction.

Additionally, the appellant's pleadings state that the sale price on the settlement statement is \$10,000 higher than the sale price on the sales contract because the final sale price included an additional parking space. The sales contract includes the purchase of two parking spaces, while the warranty deed includes three parking spaces. Based on this evidence the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein the subject's total assessment of \$54,838 was disclosed. This assessment reflects a market value of \$546,195 using the 2007 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.04%. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review submitted a memo from Matt Panush, Cook County Board of Review Analyst. The memorandum shows that 37 units in the subject's building, or 22.857% of ownership, sold between 2004 and 2007 for a total of \$11,363,194. An allocation of two percent for personal property was subtracted from the sales price, and then divided by the percentage of interest of the units to arrive at a total market value for the building of \$47,228,678. The subject's percentage of ownership, 1.0911%, was then utilized to arrive at a value for the subject of \$515,312. Based on this evidence, the board of review requested confirmation of the subject's assessment.

In rebuttal, the appellant re-affirmed the evidence previously submitted.

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. When overvaluation is claimed the appellant has the burden of proving the value of the property by a preponderance of the evidence. Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 339 Ill. App. 3d 529, 545 (1st Dist. 2002); National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 331 Ill. App. 3d 1038, 1042 (3d Dist. 2002) (citing Winnebago Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 313 Ill. App. 3d 179 (2d Dist. 2000)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). Proof of market value may consist of an appraisal, a recent arm's length sale of the subject property, recent sales of comparable properties, or recent construction costs of the subject property. Calumet Transfer, LLC v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 401 Ill. App. 3d 652, 655 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(c). Furthermore, in general, "a contemporaneous sale between parties dealing at arms [sic] length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash market value, but [is] practically conclusive." Village of Lake Villa v. Stokovich, 211 Ill. 2d 106, 132 (2004) (quoting People ex rel. Korzen v. Belt Ry. Co. of Chi., 37 Ill. 2d 158, 161 (1967)). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board concludes that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of the subject's market value is the sale of the subject in December 2005. The sale was within 13 months of the 2007 assessment date, and the appellant's pleadings state that the sale was an arm's-length transaction.

Based on this record the Board finds that the subject property had a market value of \$485,000 for tax year 2007. Since market value has been determined, the 2007 Illinois Department of Revenue three-year median level of assessment for class 2 property of 10.04% shall apply. In applying this level of

assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$48,694 while the subject's current total assessed value is above this amount. Therefore, the Board finds that a reduction is 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.

*Donald R. Cuit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fern*

Member

*Frank A. Huff*

Member

*Mario Morris*

Member

*J. R.*

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: July 20, 2012

*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.