



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

VIRGINIA SHIH,)	Appeal No. 23-111946
Complaint,)	
v.)	
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)	
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION AND ORDER UPON APPLICATION FOR REVIEW AFFIRMING DECISION AND ORDER OF HEARING OFFICER

On June 25, 2025, Complainant filed an Application for Review of a Decision and Order issued on June 11, 2025 pertaining to property classified as residential. Complainant alleged overvaluation and further alleged that the true value in money of the subject property on January 1, 2023 was \$523,000. Following an evidentiary hearing on May 6, 2025, the Hearing Officer found that the Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence to support the asserted claim of overvaluation and affirmed the assessment of the Board of Equalization, which found the value of the property to be \$773,700.

Complainant did not submit any documentary evidence at the hearing. Along with her Application for Review, Complainant submitted three photos and very brief discussion of properties located at 219 Lancaster Drive and 121 Topton Way. However, it appears that this information duplicates her testimony at the hearing. Respondent appeared and submitted evidence.

The Commission has jurisdiction in this matter to correct any assessment which is

shown to be unlawful, unfair, improper, arbitrary, or capricious. Article X, Section 14, Mo. Const. of 1945; Sections 138.430, 138.431, 138.431.4¹. Upon Application for Review, the Commission may affirm, modify, reverse, or set aside the decision and order of the Hearing Officer on the basis of the evidence previously submitted, may take additional evidence, or may remand the matter to the Hearing Officer with directions. Section 138.432 RSMo.

The Commission has reviewed the Decision and Order of the Hearing Officer which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference. The Commission adopts as its own all findings of fact and conclusions of law of the Hearing Officer.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The decision of the Hearing Officer determining the true value in money of the subject property on January 1, 2023 to be 773,700 is affirmed.

Judicial review of this Order may be had in the manner provided in Sections 138.432 and 536.100 to 536.140 RSMo within 30 days of the mailing date set forth in the Certificate of Service for this Order.

If judicial review of this decision is made, any protested taxes presently in an escrow account in accordance with this appeal shall be held pending the final decision of the courts unless disbursed pursuant to Section 139.031.8 RSMo.

If no judicial review is made within thirty days, this decision and order is deemed final and the Collector, as well as the collectors of all affected political subdivisions therein, shall disburse the protested taxes presently in an escrow account in accord with the decision on the underlying assessment in this appeal.

¹ All statutory citations are to the RSMo. 2000, as amended, unless otherwise indicated.

SO ORDERED August 21, 2025.

Gary Romine, Chairman

Debbi McGinnis, Commissioner

Greg Razer, Commissioner

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been sent electronically or mailed postage prepaid August 22, 2025, to: Complainant(s) and/or Counsel for Complainant(s), the County Assessor and/or Counsel for Respondent and County Collector.

Stacy M. Ingle
Legal Assistant



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

VIRGINIA SHIH,)	
)	
Complainant(s),)	
)	Appeal No. 23-111946
v.)	Parcel No. 18K240344
)	
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)	
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION AND ORDER

Virginia Shih (Complainant) appealed the St. Louis County Board of Equalization's (BOE) decision finding the true value in money (TVM) of the subject property on January 1, 2023, was \$773,700. Complainant alleges overvaluation and proposes that the TVM of the subject as of that date was \$523,000.² The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property on January 1, 2023, was \$773,700.

The evidentiary hearing was held on May 6, 2025, via Webex. Complainant appeared *pro se* via phone and Respondent was represented by counsel Kevin Wyatt. The appeal was heard and decided by Senior Hearing Officer Benjamin Slawson.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject residential real property is located at 1111

² Complainant timely filed a complaint for review of assessment. The State Tax Commission (STC) has authority to hear and decide Complainant's appeal. Mo. Const. art. X, sec. 14; Section 138.430.1, RSMo 2000. All statutory citations are to RSMo 2000, as amended.

Lancaster Dr., Saint Louis, Missouri, Parcel No. 18K240344. The subject property consists of a two-bedroom, one- bathroom ranch house built in 1947 on a 9,000 square foot lot. The house has 1,374 square feet of living space. The home does not have a finished basement.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$773,700. The BOE independently determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$773,700.

3. Complainant's Evidence. Complainant did not submit any documentary evidence. Complainant testified that her house is the closest to the main street compared to others in the neighborhood. Complainant asserted that her house is therefore less desirable as it is close to busy traffic and being located nearest to commercial properties including a restaurant, urgent care center, and a bank.

Complainant also testified that her house is less marketable than others due to its older age and only having two bedrooms, one bathroom, and an unfinished basement. Complainant also added that the lot is located lower than adjacent properties in the neighborhood, causing stormwater to pool around her property and flood her yard.

Complainant testified that she found that other houses in her neighborhood, have larger lots, more bathrooms, or better features yet they were comparatively appraised to be lower than the subject (219 Lancaster Drive, Parcel No. 18K520019 and 121 Topton Way, Parcel No. 18K240432). Last, Complainant testified that she received an offer to purchase her home in 2024 from an investment company for \$559,000.

4. Respondent's Evidence. Respondent submitted Exhibit 1, consisting of the October 17, 2023, BOE decision letter for the subject property. Exhibit 1 shows the BOE

valued the subject property at \$773,700. Exhibit 1 was admitted without objection.

5. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$773,700.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Assessment and Valuation. Residential real property is assessed at 19% of its TVM as of January 1 of each odd-numbered year. Section 137.115.5(1)(a). The TVM is "the fair market value of the property on the valuation date[.]" *Snider v. Casino Aztar/Aztar Mo. Gaming Corp.*, 156 S.W.3d 341, 346 (Mo. banc 2005) (internal quotation omitted). The fair market value is "the price which the property would bring from a willing buyer when offered for sale by a willing seller." *Mo. Baptist Children's Home v. State Tax Comm'n*, 867 S.W.2d 510, 512 (Mo. banc 1993). "True value in money is defined in terms of value in exchange not value in use." *Tibbs v. Poplar Bluff Assocs. I, L.P.*, 599 S.W.3d 1, 7 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020) (internal quotation omitted). "Determining the true value in money is an issue of fact for the STC." *Cohen v. Bushmeyer*, 251 S.W.3d 345, 348 (Mo. App. E.D. 2008).

"For purposes of levying property taxes, the value of real property is typically determined using one or more of three generally accepted approaches." *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 346. The three generally accepted approaches are the cost approach, the income approach, and the comparable sales approach. *Id.* at 346-48. The STC has wide discretion in selecting the appropriate valuation method but "cannot base its decision on opinion evidence that fails to consider information that should have been considered under a particular valuation approach." *Id.*, at 348.

The comparable sales approach "is most appropriate when there is an active market

for the type of property at issue such that sufficient data are available to make a comparative analysis.” *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 348. For this reason, the comparable sales approach is typically used to value residential property. “The comparable sales approach uses prices paid for similar properties in arms-length transactions and adjusts those prices to account for differences between the properties.” *Id.* at 347-48 (internal quotation omitted). “Comparable sales consist of evidence of sales reasonably related in time and distance and involve land comparable in character.” *Id.* at 348.

2. Evidence. “Although technical rules of evidence are not controlling in administrative hearings, fundamental rules of evidence are applicable.” *Mo. Church of Scientology v. State Tax Comm’n*, 560 S.W.2d 837, 839 (Mo. banc 1977). The hearing officer is the finder of fact and determines the credibility and weight of the evidence. *Kelly v. Mo. Dep’t of Soc. Servs., Family Support Div.*, 456 S.W.3d 107, 111 (Mo. App. W.D. 2015). “It is within the purview of the hearing officer to determine the method of valuation to be adopted in a given case.” *Tibbs v. Poplar Bluff Assocs. I, L.P.*, 599 S.W.3d 1, 9 (Mo. App. S.D. 2020). The hearing officer “may inquire of the owner of the property or of any other party to the appeal regarding any matter or issue relevant to the valuation, subclassification or assessment of the property.” Section 138.430.2. The Hearing Officer’s decision regarding the assessment or valuation of the property may be based solely upon his inquiry and any evidence presented by the parties, or based solely upon evidence presented by the parties. *Id.*

3. Complainant's Burden of Proof. The taxpayer bears the burden of proof and must show by a preponderance of the evidence that the property was overvalued. *Westwood P’ship v. Gogarty*, 103 S.W.3d 152, 161 (Mo. App. E.D. 2003). The BOE’s valuation is

presumptively correct. *Tibbs*, 599 S.W.3d at 7. The "taxpayer may rebut this presumption by presenting substantial and persuasive evidence that the valuation is erroneous." *Id.* (internal quotation omitted). The taxpayer also must prove "the value that should have been placed on the property." *Id.* "Substantial evidence is that evidence which, if true, has probative force upon the issues, and from which the trier of fact can reasonably decide the case on the fact issues." *Savage v. State Tax Comm'n*, 722 S.W.2d 72, 77 (Mo. banc 1986) (internal quotation omitted). Evidence is persuasive when it has "sufficient weight and probative value to convince the trier of fact." *Daly v. P.D. George Co.*, 77 S.W.3d 645, 651 (Mo. App. E.D. 2002); *see also White v. Dir. of Revenue*, 321 S.W.3d 298, 305 (Mo. banc 2010) (noting the burden of persuasion is the "party's duty to convince the fact-finder to view the facts in a way that favors that party").

4. Complainant Did Not Produce Substantial and Persuasive Evidence of Overvaluation.

Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence to support his \$523,000 opinion of value and claim of overvaluation.

Although reasonable to assume that two similar properties should be valued similarly, comparative assessment is not the method used to find a TVM for a property. Therefore, Complainant's testimony regarding the comparative assessment of other properties in her neighborhood is not persuasive evidence. Neither is evidence of an investment company's offer to purchase her property for less than the TMV found by the BOE. Such a sale would not be an arms-length sale as the investment company's goal is to purchase properties less than market value and then turn a profit upon reselling.

Concerning the older age and alleged undesirable location of the subject property that

Complainant testified to, Complainant provided no evidence providing a way to quantify the dollar amount effect of these characteristics on value nor did Complainant show that the BOE value did not account for these issues.

The comparable sales approach is the usual method used to determine the TVM of residential real property. “The comparable sales approach uses prices paid for similar properties in arms-length transactions and adjusts those prices to account for differences between the properties.” *Snider*, 156 S.W.3d at 347-48 (internal quotation omitted). Complainant did not provide an appraisal report from an independent appraiser determining value based on market-based adjustments to sales prices of comparable properties at the time of the assessment date.

Complainant has not proven that the TVM of the subject property is \$523,000 as of January 1, 2023. While a property owner’s opinion of value is generally admissible, the opinion “is without probative value where it is shown to have been based upon improper elements or an improper foundation.” *Shelby Cty. R-IV Sch. Dist. v. Herman*, 392 S.W.2d 609, 613 (Mo. 1965); see also *Cohen v. Bushmeyer*, 251 S.W.3d 345, 349 (Mo. App. W.D. 2008) (noting a property owner’s opinion of value loses probative value when it rests on an improper foundation). Complainant’s alleged valuation is based on improper elements and therefore is speculative.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$773,700.

Application for Review

A party may file an application for review of this decision within 30 days of the

mailing date set forth in the certificate of service for this decision. The application "shall contain specific detailed grounds upon which it is claimed the decision is erroneous." Section 138.432. The application must be in writing, and may be mailed to the State Tax Commission of Missouri, P.O. Box 146, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0146, or emailed to Legal@stc.mo.gov. A copy of the application must be sent to each person listed below in the certificate of service. ***Failure to state specific facts or law upon which the application for review is based will result in summary denial.*** Section 138.432.

Disputed Taxes

The Collector of St. Louis County, and the collectors of all affected political subdivisions therein, shall continue to hold the disputed taxes pending the possible filing of an application for review, unless the disputed taxes have been disbursed pursuant to a court order under the provisions of section 139.031.

SO ORDERED June 11, 2025.

Benjamin C. Slawson
Senior Hearing Officer
State Tax Commission

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically mailed and/or sent by U.S. Mail on June 13th, 2025, to: Complainant(s) and/or Counsel for Complainant(s), the County Assessor and/or Counsel for Respondent and County Collector.

Stacy M. Ingle
Legal Assistant