



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

APPELLANT: Manjunath Ramanna  
DOCKET NO.: 10-24364.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 09-14-408-019-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Manjunath Ramanna, the appellant, by attorney Christopher G. Walsh, Jr. 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: \$7,192**  
**IMPR: \$30,308**  
**TOTAL: \$37,500**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a two-story multi-family dwelling of masonry construction. The dwelling is approximately 45 years old and contains 5,049 square feet of living area. The dwelling has six apartment units, a full basement finished with an apartment, and central air conditioning. The subject property has a 9,280 square foot site and is located in Niles, Maine Township, Cook County.

The appellant's appeal is based on overvaluation. In support of this argument, the appellant submitted evidence disclosing the subject property was purchased on May 20, 2010 for a price of \$375,000 or \$74.27 per square foot of living area, land included. The appellant partially completed Section IV - Recent Sale Data of the residential appeal form and disclosed the name of the seller, Citibank, and that the subject's sale was not a transfer between related parties. The appellant did not answer the questions that asked if the property had been advertised for sale and for how long. To further document the sale, the appellant submitted a copy of the final settlement statement,

disclosing the subject property was purchased on May 20, 2010 for a price of \$375,000. The settlement statement also revealed that a commission was paid to a realty firm. The appellant also produced an affidavit, wherein the appellant stated that he had used the services of a real estate broker. The appellant also provided a copy of the subject's MLS listing which revealed that the subject property was listed for two months before it sold in May 2010. In a letter that accompanied the appeal, counsel stated the subject had a market value of \$375,000 and the assessment should be calculated by applying the 10% ordinance level of assessment for Class 2 residential property in Cook County. Based on this record, the appellant requested the subject's assessment be reduced to \$37,500.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein its final assessment of the subject totaling \$55,940 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$559,400 or \$110.79 per square foot of living area, land included, using the 10% ordinance level of assessment for Class 2 residential property in Cook County.

In support of the assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sale properties that are improved with two-story multi-family dwellings of frame or masonry construction. The dwellings range in age from 41 to 117 years and contain from 2,832 to 4,818 square feet of living area. One of the comparables has the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject. Three comparables have garages; two comparables have central air conditioning; and three comparables have full basements, one of which is finished with an apartment. The board of review did not disclose the number of apartment units in each dwelling. The comparables have sites ranging in size from 6,000 to 15,344 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from January 2009 to July 2010 for prices that ranged from \$323,216 to \$610,000 or from \$114.13 to \$151.56 per square foot of living area, land included.

In addition, Nicholas Jordan, a board of review analyst, submitted a brief challenging the arm's length nature of the subject's sale. The board of review analyst submitted evidence that indicated the May 20, 2010 sale of the subject property was a compulsory sale due to foreclosure. This evidence consisted of print-outs from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds' website. The information from the Cook County Recorder of Deeds revealed that Citibank had placed a lis pendens notice on the subject property on June 18, 2009. 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 warranted.

The appellant contends the market value of the subject property is not accurately reflected in its assessed valuation. Fair cash value is defined in the Property Tax Code as "[t]he amount for which a property can be sold in the due course of business and trade, not under duress, between a willing buyer and a willing seller." (35 ILCS 200/1-50). The Supreme Court of Illinois has construed "fair cash value" to mean what the property would bring at a voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is ready, willing, and able to buy but not forced to do so to do. Springfield Marine Bank v. Property Tax Appeal Board, 44 Ill.2d 428 (1970). A contemporaneous sale between two parties dealing at arm's length is not only relevant to the question of fair cash value but practically conclusive on the issue on whether the assessment is reflective of market value. Korzen v. Belt Railway Co. of Chicago, 37 Ill.2d 158 (1967). When market value is the basis of the appeal the value of the property must be proved by a preponderance of the evidence. National City Bank of Michigan/Illinois v. Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board, 331 Ill.App.3d 1038 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dist. 2002); 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 appellant has met this burden of proof and a reduction in the subject's assessment is warranted.

The Board finds the best evidence of market value in the record is the sale of the subject property on May 20, 2010 for a price of \$375,000. The appellant revealed that the subject's sale had some of the elements of an arm's length transaction. The evidence disclosed that the subject property had been exposed to the open market prior to its sale in May 2010. On the transfer declaration, question #7 ("Was the property advertised for sale?") was marked "YES". The appellant provided a copy of the settlement statement which revealed that a commission had been paid to a realty firm. The appellant produced a copy of the subject's MLS listing which revealed that the subject property had been listed for two months before it sold in May 2010. The subject property has an assessment of \$55,940 that reflects a

market value of \$559,400. The Board finds the subject's purchase price is less than the market value reflected by the assessment.

The Board finds that the board of review challenged the arm's length nature of the transaction but was not able to refute the appellant's overvaluation argument. The board of review presented four properties that were not truly comparable to the subject property. Comparable #2 was substantially older than the subject, and comparables #1, #3, and #4 had considerably less living area. In addition, the sale dates of board of review comparables #1 and #4 were not as close to the January 1, 2010 assessment date as the sale of the subject in May 2010. Consequently, the Board gave little weight to the board of review's market value evidence.

Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$375,000 as of January 1, 2010 and a reduction commensurate with the appellant's request is appropriate.

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

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: April 18, 2014

*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.