



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

APPELLANT: Mikhail Davidyan  
DOCKET NO.: 10-33196.001-R-1  
PARCEL NO.: 03-21-212-030-0000

The parties of record before the Property Tax Appeal Board are Mikhail Davidyan, 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: \$6,031**  
**IMPR.: \$25,969**  
**TOTAL: \$32,000**

Subject only to the State multiplier as applicable.

**ANALYSIS**

The subject property is improved with a one and one-half story dwelling of frame and masonry construction. The dwelling is approximately 31 years old and contains 3,166 square feet of living area. Features of the home include a full unfinished basement, central air conditioning, a fireplace, and a two and one-half car garage. The subject property has an 11,489 square foot site and is located in Arlington Heights, Wheeling 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 August 18, 2009 for a price of \$320,000 or \$101.07 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, Deutsche Bank, and that the subject's sale was not a transfer between related parties. To further document the sale, the appellant submitted a copy of the Illinois Real Estate Transfer Declaration, PTAX-203, disclosing the subject property

was purchased in August 2009 for a price of \$320,000. On the transfer declaration, question #7 ("Was the property advertised for sale?") was marked "YES". The appellant also produced an affidavit, wherein the appellant stated that he had used the services of a real estate broker. In a letter that accompanied the appeal, counsel stated the subject had a market value of \$320,000 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 \$32,000.

The board of review submitted its "Board of Review Notes on Appeal" wherein its final assessment of the subject totaling \$40,635 was disclosed. The subject's assessment reflects a market value of \$454,530 or \$143.57 per square foot of living area, land included, using the 2010 three year average median level of assessments for class 2 property in Cook County of 8.94% as determined by the Illinois Department of Revenue. (86 Ill.Admin.Code §1910.50(c)(2)).

In support of the assessment, the board of review submitted information on four comparable sales improved with one-story dwellings of masonry or frame and masonry construction. The dwellings range in age from 39 to 43 years. Each dwelling contains 2,450 square feet of living area. Each comparable has the same assigned neighborhood code as the subject. One of the comparables is located in the same tax block as the subject, and the other three comparables are located one-quarter mile from the subject. Features include central air conditioning, a fireplace, a garage, and a partial basement, one of which is finished. The comparables have sites ranging from 8,750 to 10,000 square feet of land area. The comparables sold from May 2007 to August 2009 for prices that ranged from \$350,000 to \$527,500 or from \$142.86 to \$215.31 per square foot of living area, land included. As part of its evidence, the board of review disclosed that the subject property sold in August 2009 for \$320,000 or for \$101.08 per square foot of living area, land included. 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 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 August 18, 2009 for a price of \$320,000. 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's sale was not a transfer between related parties. On the transfer declaration, question #7 ("Was the property advertised for sale?") was marked "YES". Additionally, the board of review's evidence made reference to the August 18, 2009 sale of the subject property for a price of \$320,000. The subject property has an assessment of \$40,635 that reflects a market value of \$454,530. 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 did not present any evidence to challenge the arm's length nature of the transaction and was not able to refute the appellant's overvaluation argument. Although the board of review presented four comparable sales, three of these sales occurred from May 2007 to March 2009 and were not as proximate in time to the January 1, 2010 assessment date as the sale of the subject in August 2009.

Moreover, these comparable sales had dwellings that were not truly comparable to the subject property. The comparables presented by the board of review were one-story dwellings that were older and much smaller than the subject. Consequently, the Board gave little weight to this evidence.

Based on this record the Board finds the subject property had a market value of \$320,000 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.




\_\_\_\_\_  
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: April 18, 2014



\_\_\_\_\_  
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.