



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

APPELLANT: Janet Capiz  
DOCKET NO.: 10-30480.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 13-21-403-028-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Janet Capiz, the appellant, by attorney Adam E. Bossov, of Law Offices of Adam E. Bossov, 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 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: \$ 5,902**  
**IMPR.: \$ 26,359**  
**TOTAL: \$ 32,261**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject has 3,689 square feet of land that is improved with an 87 year old, two-story, masonry, multi-family building. The subject's improvement size is 2,102 square feet of building area, which equates to an improvement assessment of \$12.54 per square foot of building area. Its total assessment is \$32,261, which yields a fair market value of \$360,861, or \$171.68 per square foot of building area (including land), after applying the 2010 Illinois Department of Revenue three year median level of assessment for Class 2 properties of 8.94%. The appellant, via counsel, argued that there was unequal treatment in the assessment process of the subject's improvement, and also that the fair market value of the subject property was not accurately reflected in its assessed value as the bases of this appeal.

In support of the equity argument, the appellant submitted descriptive and assessment information for six properties suggested as comparable to the subject. The comparables are

described as one and one-half story, frame, masonry, or frame and masonry, multi-family dwellings. Additionally, the comparables range: in age from 41 to 116 years; in size from 2,051 to 2,547 square feet of living area; and in improvement assessments from \$6.97 to \$9.78 per square foot of living area. Black and white photographs of the subject and comparables were submitted. The comparables also have various amenities, however, neither the property class nor the number of bedrooms was listed for the comparable properties.

In support of the market value argument, the appellant submitted evidence showing that the subject sold in March 2009 for \$230,900. This evidence included a settlement statement, a printout from the Multiple Listing Service, and a warranty deed. Furthermore, the appellant's pleadings state that the sale was not between related parties, that the subject was advertised for sale for nine days, that the parties used a real estate broker, that this was a cash transaction and that the sale was pursuant to a foreclosure. A list of seven properties located in Chicago that sold between 1988 and 2009 was also attached. 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 \$32,261 was disclosed. Their evidence was not timely submitted, therefore, the board of review was found to be in default under Sections 1910.40(a) and 1910.69(a) of the Official Rules of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Accordingly, the board of review's evidence was not considered in this appeal.

After reviewing the record and considering the evidence, the Property Tax Appeal Board (the "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). "[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).

In addressing the appellant's market value argument, the Board finds that the sale of the subject in March 2009 for \$230,900 was a "compulsory sale." A "compulsory sale" is defined as:

(i) the sale of real estate for less than the amount owed to the mortgage lender or mortgagor, if the lender or mortgagor has agreed to the sale, commonly referred to as a "short sale" and (ii) the first sale of real estate owned by a financial institution as a result of a judgment of foreclosure, transfer pursuant to a deed in lieu of foreclosure, or consent judgment, occurring after the foreclosure proceeding is complete.

35 ILCS 200/1-23. Real property in Illinois must be assessed at its fair cash value, which can only be estimated absent any compulsion on either party.

Illinois law requires that all real property be valued at its fair cash value, estimated at the price it would bring at a fair voluntary sale where the owner is ready, willing, and able to sell but not compelled to do so, and the buyer is likewise ready, willing, and able to buy, but is not forced to do so.

Bd. of Educ. of Meridian Cmty. Unit Sch. Dist. No. 223 v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 961 N.E. 2d 794, 802 (2d Dist. 2011) (citing Chrysler Corp. v. Ill. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 69 Ill. App. 3d 207, 211 (2d Dist. 1979)).

However, when there is a recent sale of the subject, and that sale is a compulsory sale, the Board may consider evidence which would show whether the sale price was representative of the subject's fair cash value. Calumet Transfer, 401 Ill. App. 3d at 655-56. In this case, the appellant did not submit any such evidence to show that the sale of the subject in March 2009 for \$230,900 was at its fair cash value. Such evidence could have included the descriptive and sales information for recently sold properties that are similar to the subject. See id. at 656.

The sales submitted by the appellant dated from 1988 and are too far removed from the lien date to accurately reflect the subject's market value as of January 1, 2010. Since there is no evidence that the sale price of the subject was at its fair cash value, the Board finds that the subject is not overvalued and a reduction is not warranted.

The appellant also contends unequal treatment in the subject's improvement assessment as the basis of this 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. Walsh v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 181 Ill. 2d 228, 234 (1998) (citing Kankakee Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 131 Ill. 2d 1 (1989)); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.63(e). To succeed in an appeal based on lack of uniformity, the appellant must submit documentation "showing the similarity, proximity and lack of distinguishing characteristics of the assessment comparables to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d 139, 145 (1st Dist. 2010); 86 Ill. Admin. Code § 1910.65(b). "[T]he critical consideration is not the number of allegedly similar properties, but whether they are in fact 'comparable' to the subject property." Cook Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 403 Ill. App. 3d at 145 (citing DuPage Cnty. Bd. of Review v. Prop. Tax Appeal Bd., 284 Ill. App. 3d 649, 654-55 (2d Dist. 1996)). After an analysis of the assessment data, the Board finds that the appellant has not met this burden.

The Board finds that only comparable #4 was similar to the subject in style and design. Although the remaining suggested comparables are similar in location, the photographs indicate they vary in style, design and exterior construction from the subject. It is also unclear from the evidence whether these comparables are multi-family dwellings. As such, the Board finds that the appellant has not met the burden of clear and convincing evidence, as there is no range of equity comparables with which to compare the subject. Therefore, 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. Crit*

Chairman

*K. L. Fan*

Member

*Richard A. Huff*

Member

*Mario M. Lino*

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: March 21, 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.