



STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

KAISER FAMILY TRUST,) Appeal No. 23-10267
) Parcel ID: 20Q630162
 Complainant(s),)
)
 v.)
)
 JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR,)
 ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,)
)
 Respondent.)

DECISION AND ORDER

Kaiser Family Trust (Complainants) appeal 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 \$948,000.¹ Complainants 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 \$948,000.

The evidentiary hearing was held on January 22, 2026, via Webex. Complainants did not attend the evidentiary hearing. Respondent Jake Zimmerman, Assessor, St. Louis

¹ Complainants timely filed a complaint for review of assessment. The State Tax Commission (STC) has authority to hear and decide Complainants' appeal. Mo. Const. art. X, sec. 14; Section 138.430.1, RSMo 2000. All statutory citations are to RSMo 2000, as amended.

County, Missouri, was represented by counsel, Steve Robson. The case was heard and decided by Hearing Officer Samuel Knapper.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject property is in St. Louis County, Missouri with Parcel number 20Q630162.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent classified the subject property as residential and determined the TVM on January 1, 2023, was \$966,300. The BOE independently considered this matter and determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$948,000.

3. Complainants' Evidence. Complainants did not submit evidence.

4. Respondent's Evidence. Respondent introduced Exhibit 1, the BOE's October 17, 2023, Decision Letter. Respondent's Exhibit 1 was admitted into evidence.

5. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$948,000.

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. Complainants' 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. Complainants Did Not Produce Substantial and Persuasive Evidence of Overvaluation. Complainant did not submit any evidence and did not prove overvaluation. Complainant did not appear at the evidentiary hearing and produced no evidence to support the overvaluation claim. Complainant's failure to appear and to present any evidence necessarily means Complainant fails to meet his burden of proof.²

5. Trust Beneficiaries Must Attain Legal Representation. The Complainants in this case are not lawyers and they are beneficiaries of a trust which holds the subject property; consequently, they cannot represent themselves in this proceeding. Missouri law prohibits a person who is not an attorney from signing a Complaint for Review on behalf of a legal entity. To do so is to engage in the unauthorized practice of law. Missouri law defines the practice of law as follows:

484.010. Practice of the law and law business defined. – 1. The "practice of the law" is hereby defined to be and is the appearance as an advocate in a representative capacity or the drawing of papers, pleadings or documents or the performance of any act in such

² For over 150 years, Missouri law has recognized the self-evident proposition that "if there be no evidence sufficient in law to make a prima facie case on this issue, plaintiff cannot be entitled to recover." *Callahan v. Warne*, 40 Mo. 131, 135 (Mo. 1867).

capacity in connection with proceedings pending or prospective before any court of record, commissioner, referee or any body, board, committee or commission constituted by law or having authority to settle controversies.

With respect to proceedings before the STC, 12 CSR 30-3.010 provides:

(2) On any appeal taken to the commission from the local board of equalization, a natural person may represent him/herself in the proceedings before the commission. The county assessor, but not a deputy, may represent his/her office in such proceedings. All others must appear through an attorney licensed to practice law in Missouri or in another jurisdiction. (A) Any person who signs a pleading or brief, or who enters an appearance at a hearing for an entity or another person, by an act expressly represents that s/he is authorized to so act and that s/he is a licensed attorney-at law in this state or his/her state of residence.

The STC website provides instructions for filing a Complaint for Review:

The taxpayer who is the owner of the property may sign the Complaint for Review of Assessment form unless the property is in the name of a legal entity or a trust. Missouri law requires that an attorney must sign the form on behalf of the taxpayer/owner if the taxpayer/owner is a legal entity (for example, a corporation, a LLC, a partnership) OR a trust, association, or estate. NO EXCEPTIONS.

Further, the Complaint for Review reads: “Only Attorney is required for all corporations, partnerships, other legal entities, and trusts.”

Many people title property in the name of a trust, limited liability company (LLC), corporation, limited partnership, or other legal entity for estate planning or tax purposes. There can be significant benefits to holding property in a legal entity. One of the consequences of doing so, however, is that an attorney must represent the legal entity in any legal proceedings, including those before the STC. This is true even if the legal entity is 100% owned by one person or by a husband and wife.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was \$948,000.

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 February 19, 2026.

STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

Samuel Knapper
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 February 20, 2026, 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