

**BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION
AND REVIEW COMMISSION**

LONNIE G. FRIMANN and)
JANET FRIMANN,)
)
Appellants,)
)
vs.)
)
BOX BUTTE COUNTY BOARD OF)
EQUALIZATION,)
)
Appellee.)

CASE NO. 98A-379
**FINDINGS AND ORDER
ADOPTING RECOMMENDATIONS
OF SPECIAL MASTER
(DECISION OF COUNTY AFFIRMED)**

The Special Master for the Nebraska Tax Equalization and Review Commission called the above-captioned case for a hearing on the merits of the appeal in the City of Gering, Scotts Bluff County, Nebraska, on the 1st day of September, 1999, pursuant to a Notice of Hearing issued the 16th day of July, 1999.

Lonnie G. Frimann and Janet Frimann, ("Taxpayers") appeared personally at the hearing, and the Box Butte County Board of Equalization appeared through the Box Butte County Attorney. During the hearing, the Special Master took judicial notice of certain information, and each of the parties was afforded the opportunity to present evidence and argument. Each party was also afforded the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses of the opposing party as required by law.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (1998 Cum. Supp.), requires that every final decision and order entered by the Commission which is adverse to a party be stated in writing or on the record and be accompanied by findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Commission, after considering the exhibits and the recommendations of the Special Master, adopts the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Final Order in this case:

FINDINGS OF FACT

A. PROCEDURAL FINDINGS

1. That Taxpayer is the owner of record of certain agricultural real property located in Box Butte County, Nebraska ("subject property").
2. That the Box Butte County Assessor ("Assessor") proposed valuing the subject property in the amount of \$51,600 for purposes of taxation as follows as of January 1, 1998 ("assessment date").
3. That Taxpayer timely filed a protest of the proposed valuation, and requested that the subject property be valued in the amount of \$40,656. (E4).
4. That the basis of the protest was the allegation that the land is over valued. (E4).
5. That the County denied the protest. (E4).
6. That thereafter, the Taxpayer timely filed an appeal of the County's decision to the Commission. (Appeal Form).

B. SUBSTANTIVE FINDINGS AND FACTUAL CONCLUSIONS

1. That the Taxpayer adduced insufficient evidence to support his opinion of the actual or fair market value.
2. That the Commission did not consider the information contained in Exhibit 46, since the property is in a different county.
3. That the Assessor is required by law to obey all rules and regulations, the instructions and orders, and the manuals of assessment of the Property Tax Administrator.

4. That from the record before it, the Commission finds and determines that the actual or fair market value of the subject property as of January 1, 1998, was \$51,600.
5. That the decision of the County was neither unreasonable nor arbitrary.
6. That therefore the decision of the County must be affirmed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. That the Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this appeal.
2. That the Commission is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1511 (Reissue 1996) to affirm the decision of the County unless evidence is adduced establishing that the action of the County was unreasonable or arbitrary.
3. That "There is a presumption that a board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action. That presumption remains until there is competent evidence to the contrary presented, and the presumption disappears when there is competent evidence on appeal to the contrary. From that point on, the reasonableness of the valuation fixed by the board of equalization becomes one of fact based upon all the evidence presented. The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board." *Kawasaki Motors v. Lancaster Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 7 Neb. App. 655 (1998).
4. That based on the record before the Commission, insufficient evidence has been adduced to establish that the action of the County in this case was unreasonable or arbitrary.

5. That the Nebraska Supreme Court has determined that "(w)here the county assessor does not act upon his own information, or does not make a personal inspection of the property, any presumption as to the validity of the official assessment does not obtain." *Grainger Bros. Co. v. County Bd. of Equalization of Lancaster Co.*, 180 Neb. 571, 580, 144 N.W. 2d 161, 169 (1966).
6. That the appraisal of real estate is not an exact science. *Matter of Bock's Estate*, 198 Neb. 121, 124, 251 N. W. 2d 872, 874 (1977).
7. That as a matter of law the Taxpayer has NOT met the burden of persuasion as required by *Kawasaki Motors v. Lancaster Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 7 Neb. App. 655 (1998).
8. That based on the record before the Commission, the Commission must, and hereby does, conclude as a matter of law that the decision of the Box Butte County Board of Equalization which set the assessed value of the subject property for tax year 1998 was neither unreasonable nor arbitrary.
9. That therefore the decision of the Box Butte County Board of Equalization must be affirmed.

ORDER


1. That the order of the Box Butte County Board of Equalization setting the assessed value of the subject property for tax year 1998 is affirmed.
2. That Taxpayer's agricultural real property legally described as N/2, SW/4 19-24-52 in Box Butte County, Nebraska, shall be valued as follows for tax year 1998:


Land	\$51,600
Improvements	\$ 0
Total	\$51,600

3. That this decision, if no appeal is filed, shall be certified to the Box Butte County Treasurer, and the Box Butte County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1511 (Reissue 1996).
4. That this decision shall only be applicable to tax year 1998.
5. That each party is to bear its own costs in this matter.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed and sealed this 4th day of October, 1999.






Mark P. Reynolds, Chairman



Janet L. Edwards, Commissioner



Robert L. Hans, Commissioner