



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

APPELLANT: Johan Joseph
DOCKET NO.: 10-30535.001-R-1
PARCEL NO.: 14-32-127-016-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Johan Joseph, the appellant, by attorney Donald T. Rubin, of Rubin & Norris 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: \$ 23,437
IMPR.: \$ 90,909
TOTAL: \$114,346

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

ANALYSIS

The subject has 3,125 square feet of land that is improved with an 11 year old, three-story, masonry, multi-family building. The subject's improvement size is 3,510 square feet of building area, and its total assessment is \$114,346. This assessment yields a fair market value of \$1,279,038, or \$364.40 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 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 2010 for \$735,000. This evidence included a settlement statement and a sales contract. The appellant's pleadings state that the sale was not between related parties and that the parties used a real estate broker. The pleadings were silent as to how the property was advertised and the length of time the property was listed for sale. The documentation also indicated this was an estate sale purchased "as is." 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." However, this evidence was not timely submitted, and 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. Therefore, 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). Having considered the evidence presented, the Board finds that the evidence indicates a reduction is not warranted.

The evidence contained in the record does not establish that the subject's purchase was at market value. This transaction was an estate sale purchase "as is." Additionally, the appellant failed to fully complete Section IV-Recent Sale Data of their appeal petition. Without knowledge of the circumstances of this transaction, the Board cannot conclude that this was an arm's-length sale. Furthermore, the appellant failed to provide any recent sale comparables to substantiate that the sale of the subject was at market value. Therefore, the Board finds the appellant has failed to meet the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the subject is overvalued and, therefore, a reduction 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.

Donald R. Cuit

Chairman

Member

Mark Morris

Member

Member

[Signature]

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.