

STATE OF INDIANA
Board of Tax Review

In the matter of the Petition for Review)
of Assessment, Form 131) Petition No. : 18-015-95-1-4-00053

Parcel No. : 1530860000

Assessment Year: 1995

Petitioner: Central Bank and Trust/ Star Financial
3601 N. Broadway
Muncie, IN 47303

Petitioner Representative: Chambers, Galligan & Associates
Ken Chambers
116 E. Berry St.
Ft. Wayne, IN 46802

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

On January 1, 2002, pursuant to Public Law 198-2001, the Indiana Board of Tax Review (IBTR) assumed jurisdiction of all appeals then pending with the State Board of Tax Commissioners (SBTC), or the Appeals Division of the State Board of Tax Commissioners (Appeals Division). For convenience of reference, each entity (the IBTR, SBTC, and Appeals Division) is hereafter, without distinction, referred to as "State". The State having reviewed the facts and evidence, and having considered the issues, now finds and concludes the following:

Issues

1. Whether the grade of the improvement is correct.

Findings of Fact

1. If appropriate, any finding of fact made herein shall also be considered a conclusion of law. Also if appropriate, any conclusion of law made herein shall be considered a finding of fact.

2. Pursuant to Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-3, Kenneth W. Chambers of Chambers, Galligan & Associates on behalf of Central Bank and Trust/ Star Financial (Petitioner), filed a Form 131 petition requesting a review by the State. The Form 131 was file on January 30, 1996. The Delaware County Board of Review's (County Board) Notification of Final Assessment Determination on the underlying Form 130 petition is dated January 12, 1996.

3. Pursuant to Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-4, a hearing was held on July 21, 1998 before Hearing Officer Bob Coleman. Testimony and exhibits were received into evidence. Ken Chambers represented the Petitioner. Chuck Ward represented both Center Township and Delaware County.

4. At the hearing, the subject Form 131 petition was made a part of the record and labeled Board Exhibit A. Notice of Hearing on Petition is labeled Board Exhibit B. In addition, the following exhibits were submitted to the State Board:

Petitioner Exhibit A – One (1) photograph of the subject property

Respondent Exhibit A – Summary of Issues

5. The subject property is located at 3601 N. Broadway, Muncie, Center Township, Delaware County.

6. The Hearing Officer inspected the subject property on July 22, 1998. Mr. Ward was present at the viewing of the property.

Issue No. 1 – Whether the grade of the subject is correct.

7. The subject structure is a single story bank valued from the GCM pricing schedule. The grade and design factor assigned by the local officials is a “B”.
8. The grade of the subject structure is excessive. *Chambers testimony.*
9. Subject structure is correctly assessed. *Ward testimony.*

Conclusions of Law

1. The Petitioner is statutorily limited to the issues raised on the Form 130 petition filed with the Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals (PTABOA) or issues that are raised as a result of the PTABOA’s action on the Form 130 petition. Ind. Code §§ 6-1.1-15-1, -2.1, and –4. See also the Forms 130 and 131 petitions. In addition, Indiana courts have long recognized the principle of exhaustion of administrative remedies and have insisted that every designated administrative step of the review process be completed. *State v. Sproles*, 672 N.E. 2d 1353 (Ind. 1996); *County Board of Review of Assessments for Lake County v. Kranz* (1964), 224 Ind. 358, 66 N.E. 2d 896. Regarding the Form 130/131 process, the levels of review are clearly outlined by statute. First, the Form 130 petition is filed with the County and acted upon by the PTABOA. Ind. Code §§ 6-1.1-15-1 and –2.1. If the taxpayer, township assessor, or certain members of the PTABOA disagree with the PTABOA’s decision on the Form 130, then a Form 131 petition may be filed with the State. Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-3. Form 131 petitioners who raise new issues at the State level of appeal circumvent review of the issues by the PTABOA and, thus, do not follow the prescribed statutory scheme required by the statutes and case law. Once an appeal is filed with the State, however, the State has the discretion to address issues not raised on the Form 131 petition. *Joyce Sportswear Co. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 684 N.E. 2d 1189, 1191 (Ind. Tax 1997). In this appeal, such discretion will not

be exercised and the Petitioner is limited to the issues raised on the Form 131 petition filed with the State.

2. The State is the proper body to hear an appeal of the action of the County pursuant to Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-3.

A. Indiana's Property Tax System

3. Indiana's real estate property tax system is a mass assessment system. Like all other mass assessment systems, issues of time and cost preclude the use of assessment-quality evidence in every case.
4. The true tax value assessed against the property is not exclusively or necessarily identical to fair market value. *State Board of Tax Commissioners v. Town of St. John*, 702 N.E. 2d 1034, 1038 (Ind. 1998)(*Town of St. John V*).
5. The Property Taxation Clause of the Indiana Constitution, Ind. Const. Art. X, § 1 (a), requires the State to create a uniform, equal, and just system of assessment. The Clause does not create a personal, substantive right of uniformity and equality and does not require absolute and precise exactitude as to the uniformity and equality of each *individual* assessment. *Town of St. John V*, 702 N.E. 2d at 1039 – 40.
6. Individual taxpayers must have a reasonable opportunity to challenge their assessments. But the Property Taxation Clause does not mandate the consideration of whatever evidence of property wealth any given taxpayer deems relevant. *Id.* Rather, the proper inquiry in all tax appeals is “whether the system prescribed by statute and regulations was properly applied to individual assessments.” *Id.* at 1040. Only evidence relevant to this inquiry is pertinent to the State's decision.

B. Burden

7. Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-3 requires the State to review the actions of the PTABOA, but does not require the State to review the initial assessment or undertake reassessment of the property. The State has the ability to decide the administrative appeal based upon the evidence presented and to limit its review to the issues the taxpayer presents. *Whitley Products, Inc. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 704 N.E. 2d 1113, 1118 (Ind. Tax 1998) (citing *North Park Cinemas, Inc. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 689 N.E. 2d 765, 769 (Ind. Tax 1997)).
8. In reviewing the actions of the PTABOA, the State is entitled to presume that its actions are correct. “Indeed, if administrative agencies were not entitled to presume that the actions of other administrative agencies were in accordance with Indiana law, there would be a wasteful duplication of effort in the work assigned to agencies.” *Bell v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 651 N.E. 2d 816, 820 (Ind. Tax 1995). The taxpayer must overcome that presumption of correctness to prevail in the appeal.
9. It is a fundamental principle of administrative law that the burden of proof is on the person petitioning the agency for relief. 2 Charles H. Koch, Jr., *Administrative Law and Practice*, § 5.51; 73 C.J.S. Public Administrative Law and Procedure, § 128. See also Ind. Code § 4-21.5-2-4(a)(10) (Though the State is exempted from the Indiana Administrative Orders & Procedures Act, it is cited for the proposition that Indiana follows the customary common law rule regarding burden).
10. Taxpayers are expected to make factual presentations to the State regarding alleged errors in assessment. *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119. These presentations should both outline the alleged errors and support the allegations with evidence. “Allegations, unsupported by factual evidence, remain mere allegations.” *Id* (citing *Herb v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 656 N.E. 2d.

890, 893 (Ind. Tax 1995)). The State is not required to give weight to evidence that is not probative of the errors the taxpayer alleges. *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119 (citing *Clark v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 694 N.E. 2d 1230, 1239, n. 13 (Ind. Tax 1998)).

11. The taxpayer's burden in the State's administrative proceedings is two-fold: (1) the taxpayer must identify properties that are similarly situated to the contested property, and (2) the taxpayer must establish disparate treatment between the contested property and other similarly situated properties. In this way, the taxpayer properly frames the inquiry as to "whether the system prescribed by statute and regulations was properly applied to individual assessments." *Town of St. John V*, 702 N.E. 2d at 1040.
12. The taxpayer is required to meet his burden of proof at the State administrative level for two reasons. First, the State is an impartial adjudicator, and relieving the taxpayer of his burden of proof would place the State in the untenable position of making the taxpayer's case for him. Second, requiring the taxpayer to meet his burden in the administrative adjudication conserves resources.
13. To meet his burden, the taxpayer must present probative evidence in order to make a prima facie case. In order to establish a prima facie case, the taxpayer must introduce evidence "sufficient to establish a given fact and which if not contradicted will remain sufficient." *Clark*, 694 N.E. 2d at 1233; *GTE North, Inc. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 634 N.E. 2d 882, 887 (Ind. Tax 1994).
14. In the event a taxpayer sustains his burden, the burden then shifts to the local taxing officials to rebut the taxpayer's evidence and justify its decision with substantial evidence. 2 Charles H. Koch, Jr. at §5.1; 73 C.J.S. at § 128. See *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119 (The substantial evidence requirement for a taxpayer challenging a State Board determination at the Tax Court level is not "triggered" if the taxpayer does not present any probative evidence concerning

the error raised. Accordingly, the Tax Court will not reverse the State's final determination even though the taxpayer demonstrates flaws in it).

C. Review of Assessments After *Town of St. John V*

15. Because true tax value is not necessarily identical to market value, any tax appeal that seeks a reduction in assessed value solely because the assessed value assigned to the property does not equal the property's market value will fail.
16. Although the Courts have declared the cost tables and certain subjective elements of the State's regulations constitutionally infirm, the assessment and appeals process continue under the existing rules until a new property tax system is operative. *Town of St. John V*, 702 N.E. 2d at 1043; *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1121.
17. *Town of St. John V* does not permit individuals to base individual claims about their individual properties on the equality and uniformity provisions of the Indiana Constitution. *Town of St. John*, 702 N.E. 2d at 1040.

Issue No. 1 – Whether the grade of the subject is correct.

18. Grade” means the classification of an improvement based on certain construction specifications and quality of materials and workmanship. 50 IAC 2.2-1-30.
19. Grade is used in the cost approach to account for variations from the norm or “C” grade. The quality and design of a building are the most significant variables in establishing grade. 50 IAC 2.2-10-3.
20. The determination of the proper grade requires assessors to make a variety of subjective judgments regarding variations in the quality of materials and workmanship and the quality of style and design. *Mahan v. State Board of Tax*

Commissioners, 622 N.E. 2d 1058, 1064 (Ind. Tax 1993). For assessing officials and taxpayers alike, however, the Manual provides indicators for establishing grade. The text of the Manual (see 50 IAC 2.2-10-3), models and graded photographs (50 IAC 2.2-11-4), assist assessors in the selection of the proper grade factor.

21. The major grade classifications are A through E. 50 IAC 2.2-10-3. The cost schedules (base prices) in the Manual reflect the C grade standards of quality and design. The following factors (or multipliers) are assigned to each major grade classification:

“A” grade	160%
“B” grade	120%
“C” grade	100%
“D” grade	80%
“E” grade	40%

22. Intermediate grade levels are also provided for in the Manual to adequately account for quality and design features between major grade classifications. 50 IAC 2.2-10-3(c).
23. 50 IAC 2.2-10-3(d) states, “The grade selected represents a composite judgment of overall quality and design.”
24. It is the Petitioner’s position that the grade factor assigned to the subject bank is overstated at a “B”. To support this position the Petitioner presents a single exterior photograph of the subject structure.
25. The Petitioner did not present any additional evidence other than a single photograph of the subject structure in an attempt to meet his burden. A single photograph, whether it be an interior or exterior photograph, is insufficient evidence in the discussion of grade. One photograph cannot show the specific interior components or the exterior components of the structure under review.

26. Mere references to photographs or regulations, without explanation, do not qualify as probative evidence. *Heart City Chrysler v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 714 N.E. 2d 329, 333 (Ind. Tax Ct. 1999).
27. It is a fundamental principle of administrative law that the burden of proof is on the person petitioning the agency for relief. 2 Charles H. Koch, Jr., *Administrative Law and Practice*, § 5.51; 73 C.J.S. Public Administrative Law and Procedure, § 128. See also Ind. Code § 4-21.5-2-4(a)(10) (Though the State Board is exempted from the Indiana Administrative Orders & Procedures Act, it is cited for the proposition that Indiana follows the customary common law rule regarding burden).
28. “[W]hen a taxpayer challenges a real property assessment, the State Board need not search the property to find errors, the correction of which is beneficial to the taxpayer. Rather, the State Board has every right to expect that any errors in an assessment will be brought to the State Board’s attention by the taxpayer.” *Whitley Products, Inc. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 704 N.E. 2d 1113, 1118 (Ind. Tax 1998) (citing *North Park Cinemas, Inc. v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 689 N.E. 2d 765, 769 (Ind. Tax 1997)).
29. Taxpayers are expected to make factual presentations to the State Board regarding alleged errors in assessment. *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119. These presentations should both outline the alleged errors and support the allegations with evidence. “Allegations, unsupported by factual evidence, remain mere allegations.” *Id* (citing *Herb v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 656 N.E. 2d. 890, 893 (Ind. Tax 1995)). The State Board is not required to give weight to evidence that is not probative of the errors the taxpayer alleges. *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119 (citing *Clark v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 694 N.E. 2d 1230, 1239, n. 13 (Ind. Tax 1998)).

30. Where a taxpayer fails to submit evidence that is probative evidence of the error alleged, the State Board can properly refuse to consider the evidence. *Whitley*, 704 N.E. 2d at 1119 (citing *Clark v. State Board of Tax Commissioners*, 694 N.E. 2d 1230, 1239, n. 13 (Ind. Tax 1998)).
31. The taxpayer's burden in the State Board's administrative proceedings is two-fold: (1) the taxpayer must identify properties that are similarly situated to the contested property, and (2) the taxpayer must establish disparate treatment between the contested property and other similarly situated properties. In this way, the taxpayer properly frames the inquiry as to "whether the system prescribed by statute and regulations was properly applied to individual assessments." *Town of St. John V*, 702 N.E. 2d at 1040.
32. The Petitioner did not present any property record cards or photographs of other similarly situated properties in an attempt to show disparate treatment of the subject.
33. For the reasons set forth above, the Petitioner failed to meet his burden in this appeal. No change in the assessment is made as a result of this issue.

The above stated findings and conclusions are issued in conjunction with, and serve as the basis for, the Final Determination in the above captioned matter, both issued by the Indiana Board of Tax Review this ____ day of _____, 2002.

Chairman, Indiana Board of Tax Review