



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

KIMBERLY GRIFFITH,)	Appeal No. 23-10711
)	Parcel No. 36J430511
Complainant(s),)	
)	
v.)	
)	
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)	
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

DECISION AND ORDER

Kiimberly Griffith (Complainant) appeals 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 \$327,600. Complainant alleges overvaluation and claims that the TVM as of that date was \$300,000.¹ Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence of overvaluation. The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property on January 1, 2023, was \$327,600.

¹ 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.

The evidentiary hearing was held on April 29, 2025, via Webex. Complainant appeared *pro se* via Webex. Respondent Jake Zimmerman, Assessor, St. Louis County, Missouri, was represented by counsel, Steve Robson who appeared via Webex. The appeal was heard and decided by Senior Hearing Officer Samuel Knapper.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject residential real property is located at 15 Clovercrest Ct., St. Louis, Missouri with a Parcel ID of 36J430511.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent classified the subject property as residential and determined the TVM on January 1, 2023, was \$352,800. The BOE independently determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$327,600.

3. Complainant's Evidence. Complainant introduced the following Exhibit which was admitted without objection:

Exhibit	Description
A	Collective exhibit of 5 photos taken by Complainant demonstrating (4 photos of retaining wall and fence and 1 photo of foundation)

Complainant provided testimonial evidence in support of her claim of overvaluation. Complainant believes that her property is worth \$300,000. Complainant testified that her opinion of value is based upon personal research and inspection of some homes in the neighborhood. Complainant testified regarding *Exhibit A* to demonstrate that there are two cracks that go from the foundation to the basement which have been repaired

and one similar crack that has not been repaired. Complainant also used *Exhibit A* to demonstrate the condition of her retaining wall. Complainant testified that the retaining wall is in the process of failing due to water erosion. Complainant testified one of her neighbor's repaired a smaller section of the retaining wall \$80,000. Complainant testified that she attained this information directly from her neighbor. She further testified that her section of the retaining for which she is responsible for repair is greater than the section that cost \$80,000 to repair. Complainant testified that she is not in a financial position to have this repair performed at this time. Complainant believes the retaining will not remain intact without repairs being performed.

Upon cross examination Complainant testified that the retaining wall spreads across many property lines and each section of the retaining wall is the responsibility of the property owner where the section of the retaining wall lies. Complainant testified that the HOA does not pay for retaining wall expenses and that the expense is placed upon property owners. Complainant further testified that her valuation of \$300,000 is based upon her opinion of value of other houses in the area. Complainant also testified that the house received an inspection upon her purchase and there were no issues discovered with the retaining wall. Complainant testified that the BOE did not receive her pictures and that she was advised to appeal her case to the State Tax Commission.

4. Respondent's Evidence. Respondent introduced Exhibit 1, the BOE's October 17, 2023, Decision Letter. Complainant did not object. Respondent's Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

5. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$327,600.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Assessment and Valuation. Pursuant to Article X, Sections 4(a) and 4(b), Mo. Const. of 1945 real property and tangible personal property is assessed at its value or such percentage of its value as may be fixed by law for each class and for each subclass. Article X, Sections 4(a) and 4(b), Mo. Const. of 1945. 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 rebutting the presumptively correct BOE value. Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence to support her opinion of value of \$300,000 for the subject property as of January 1, 2023. Complainant did not produce evidence comprising of a comparable sales approach, income approach, or cost approach to value.

The comparable sales approach is typically used to value residential properties

improved with a single-family home. "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). In this case the Complainant did not offer any comparable sales; rather, her opinion of value was based upon personal research and inspection of some neighborhood properties. This is not a legally valid means of valuation.

Complainant testified about two condition issues for the subject and the needed updates and repairs that are needed for the property. The two issues are the failing retaining wall and the crack in the foundation. Complainant offered information she collected from neighbors but offered no professional analysis completed by someone trained to analyze such condition issues to show the deleterious effect they had on the property on the assessment date, January 1, 2023.

The lack of evidence relating to a recognized valuation method renders Complainant's proposed value speculative and unpersuasive. *See Cohen*, 251 S.W.3d at 349 (holding an opinion of value loses probative value when based on an improper foundation). Complainant did not produce substantial and persuasive evidence showing the BOE overvalued the subject property and "the value that should have been placed on the property." *Tibbs*, 599 S.W.3d at 7.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$327,600.

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 October 3, 2025.

STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

Samuel Knapper
Senior Hearing Officer

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically mailed and/or sent by U.S. Mail on October 3rd, 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