



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

APPELLANT: Charles Cisner  
DOCKET NO.: 08-27253.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-36-225-050-1002

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Charles Cisner, the appellant, by attorney Richard J. Caldarazzo, of Mar Cal Law, 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:** \$ 977  
**IMPR:** \$ 22,255  
**TOTAL:** \$ 23,232

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a class 2-99 residential condominium unit located in West Township, Cook County. The appellant, via counsel, argued that the fair market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the basis of this appeal.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted evidence showing that the subject sold in October 2007 for \$242,000. This evidence included a settlement statement and a petition form that indicated the sale was not between related parties, that the subject was advertised for sale on the open market, and that the parties used a real estate broker. Based on this evidence, the appellant requested a reduction in the subject's assessment.

The Cook County Board of Review submitted its "Board of Review-Notes on Appeal," wherein the subject's total assessment of \$24,016 was disclosed. This assessment reflects a market value of \$250,167 using the Illinois Department of Revenue's 2009 three year median level of assessment for class 2 property of 8.90%. In support of the subject's assessment, the board of review also submitted a memo from Matt Panush, Cook County Board of Review Analyst. The memorandum shows that seven units, or

89.14% of ownership, within the subject's building sold between 2006 and 2008 for a total of \$1,871,000. An allocation of two percent per unit for personal property was subtracted from the aggregate sales price then divided by the percentage of interest of units sold to arrive at a total market value for the building of \$2,056,9729. The subject's percentage of ownership, 12.05%, was then utilized to arrive at a market value for the subject unit of \$247,865. The board also submitted a grid listing for each unit in the building indicating: the property identification number; the percentage of ownership; the assessment information; and sales dates and prices generated from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds website for units that sold between 2006 and 2008. In its data, the board of review acknowledged the sale of the subject unit in October 2007 for \$242,000. 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 the evidence in the record supports a reduction in the subject's assessment.

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). "[A] contemporaneous sale between parties dealing at arm's length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash market value, (citations) but would be practically conclusive on the issue of whether an assessment was at full value." People ex rel. Korzen v. Belt Ry. Co. of Chi., 37 Ill. 2d 158, 161 (1967). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the evidence indicates a reduction is warranted.

In determining the fair market value of the subject property, the Board finds the best evidence to be the sale of the subject in October 2007 for \$242,000. The sale is within three months of the 2008 lien date, and the appellant's pleadings support the arm's-length nature of the transaction because the buyer and seller are not related, the subject was advertised for sale on the open market, and real estate brokers were used.

Therefore, the Board finds the subject had a market value of \$242,000 for the 2008 assessment year. Since the market value of this parcel has been established, the 2008 Illinois Department of

Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 property of 9.60% will apply. 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.50(c)(2)(A). In applying this level of assessment to the subject, the total assessed value is \$23,232, 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.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
Member



\_\_\_\_\_  
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: November 22, 2013



\_\_\_\_\_  
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.