STATE TAX COMMISSION OF MISSOURI

WILLIAM POWERS,	)	Appeal No. 23-10744
	)	Parcel No. 20L210161
Complainant(s),	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
JAKE ZIMMERMAN, ASSESSOR, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

DECISION AND ORDER

William Powers (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 $588,000. Complainant alleges overvaluation and claims that the TVM as of that date was $559,700 (the proposed TVM was listed in the Complainant's electronic appeal filing).[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 $588,000.

[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 October 6, 2026, via Webex. Complainant did not attend the hearing. The appeal was decided by Hearing Officer Samuel Knapper.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Subject Property. The subject residential real property is located at 22 Oak Bend Ct., St. Louis County, Missouri with a Parcel ID of 20L210161.

2. Assessment and Valuation. Respondent classified the subject property as residential and determined the TVM on January 1, 2023, was $588,000. The BOE independently determined the TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was $588,000.

3. Complainant's Evidence. Complainant did not attend the hearing. Consequently, there was no testimony or evidence introduced by the Complainant.

4. Value. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was $588,000.

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).

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).

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*.

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

The Complainant's absence at the hearing ensured there was no basis to overturn the BOE's TVM of the subject property due to the BOE's presumption of correctness. Admitting and considering evidence without the Complainant introducing it would violate fundamental rules of evidence.

CONCLUSION AND ORDER

The BOE decision is affirmed. The TVM of the subject property as of January 1, 2023, was $588,000.

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 October 27th, 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 October 30th, 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