

to:  
Cook County Treasurer  
118 N. Clark St., # 112  
Chicago, IL 60602

to:  
Cook County Assessor  
118 N. Clark St, 3rd floor  
Chicago, IL 60602

cc:  
USDOJ/ US Attorney General  
NE Illinois District  
219 S. Dearborn, 5<sup>th</sup> floor  
Chicago, IL 60604

from:  
owner/ occupant  
24 D Street  
Chicago, IL  
2010 November 15

Request for proof of market value declared on 2009-2 property tax bill for 24 D Street (PIN 00-00-000-000-0000)

Please locate a buyer who is able to and actually does appear at a closing for the purchase of my property with a valid check for \$326,460 (or more) before the 2010 December 13 due date for the 2009 second installment property tax.

I think the Cook County Treasurer is demanding an unconscionably inflated and fraudulent tax on my property, using fraudulent values provided by employees of the Cook County Assessor's office.

The Cook County Assessor declared that my home has a Market Value of \$326,460 at the 2009 triennial reassessment (The 2009-2 tax bill provides a Market Value dollar amount that the 2009 assessment notice omitted.)

The Assessor multiplied the Market Value by 10% and declared that the Assessed Valuation is \$32,646, showing a \$2,154 (6%) decrease from the 2006 triennial reassessment.

However, the Market Value is a \$108,960 (50%) increase over the 2006 triennial reassessment. The Assessed Valuation is misleading because Cook County decreased its longstanding Assessment Level from 16% to 10%.

According to the Assessor, the 2006 Market Value of my home was \$217,500, a \$54,031 (34%) increase over the 2003 triennial reassessment. The 2006 Assessed Valuation was \$34,800 (16% of the Market Value) that year.

year	increase	Market Value	Assessed Value
2000	28%	104,181	16,669
2003	27%	143,469	22,955
2006	34%	217,500	34,800
2009	50%	326,460	32,646

The selling prices of homes in my area began to deflate before the 2006 triennial reassessment. (For example, a two-unit brick building next door to me at 28 D Street was listed at \$189,000 in 2010 September and remains unsold.)

I paid \$31,000 for my home in 1976. Nobody has proved the Assessor's declared Market Values for the subsequent 33 years by giving me a check for any of his various values at a closing.

The Assessor determines Market Value on the advice of local elected officials, mortgage lenders and real estate agents. That is, the Assessor solicits the opinions of three classes of people who've vested their personal financial interests in real estate inflation and destabilizing neighborhoods. The entities that decide Market Value have opportunity as well as motive to tamper with the data they use to calculate market values.

For example, mortgage lenders can borrow property tax revenues to finance inflated loans on a few properties to spiral profitable inflation on all properties. 49 D Street illustrates the problem. The Assessor describes 49 as a one-story single-family home, though it has a full second floor and three apartments. It sold as a two-flat in 2003 and the buyer added a basement apartment. But, because of the fraudulent description, the price of the three-unit income property can be used to calculate the Market Value of single-family homes, whether they do or don't go on the market.

The fraudulent description of 49 influenced the Market Value of a single-family home at 46. Two consecutive 46 purchasers put the house back on the market soon after they bought it, in part because they couldn't afford the high price they agreed to pay. 46 has been on the market for the past two years.

Meanwhile, the 49 purchaser was tax delinquent until 2009 July, indicating that even with rental income she was late on mortgage payments to the lender, and the lender delayed her tax payments until she paid him. Her \$250,000 mortgage of 2003 equaled the seller's warranty deed. She re-financed the property at \$297,000 (2004) and \$368,000 (2006).

16 D Street provides another example of fraud. 16 is one of four identical properties 15-18. The inflated selling price of 16 D Street in 2006 seems to have influenced the alleged Market Value of 18 D Street. Though the two most recent 16 purchasers paid more than the most recent 15 and 18 purchasers, 16 is valued lower than 15 and 18. (Variations in Market Value of the four homes might be influenced by race and religion more than sales price and improvements.)

house	Market Value	2009 tax	purchaser	long-term exemption
15	274,340	\$3,355	black city worker, 2002	yes
16	219,590	\$3,427	Hispanic, 2009	no
17	223,030	\$2,554	white city worker, 1960, attends alderman's church	yes
18	308,960	\$4,822	white, 1995	no

Yet another example of the potential for fraud exists in the Assessor's descriptions of 22 D Street and 24 D Street. The two houses are identical; and the original descriptions should have been the same. But the descriptions have been tampered with. The Assessor now declares a \$264,390 Market Value for 22 D Street (\$63,390 less than 24 D Street). The Northwest Home Equity Assurance program valued 24 at \$264,000 in 2004 for 2009. A reverse mortgage offer valued 24 at \$150,000 in 2010.

A table of assessments and taxes for my home 1976-2009 is on the next page. Go to [www.timefordemocracy.com](http://www.timefordemocracy.com) for more on property tax fraud. Click on tutorials followed by property tax.

year	all tax paid	school tax percent	general tax paid	schools tax paid	Chicago school finance authority	Chicago Board of Education	Chicago school building fund	full tax	total exemptions	homeowner exemption	long-time home owner exemption	elderly & disabled homestead exemption	independent appraisal	independent appraiser	Cook Co. assessor's description	Cook Co. reassesses years	Cook Co. % independent appraiser	Cook Co. market value change	Cook Co. assessor market value	Cook Co. assessed valuation	Cook Co. multiplier	Illinois multiplier	Illinois equalized valuation (EAV)	EAV percent Cook Co. assess.		
1976	548							unknown		yes	na	yes	31,000	buyer					unknown							
1977	685	41%	403	282		282		unknown		yes	na	no				4		unknown	33,719	5,395	0.1600		7,636	142%		
1978	688	41%	409	280		280		unknown		yes	na	no							33,719	5,395	0.1600		7,636	142%		
1979	750	37%	473	277		277		848	99	yes	na	no	58,000	insure replace house only					33,719	5,395	0.1600	1.8016	7,636	142%		
1980	748	42%	430	318	43	275	(1)	921	173	yes	na	no							33,719	5,395	0.1600	1.7432	7,636	142%		
1981	846	41%	495	350	45	305		1,132	286	yes	na	no				4		16%	39,988	6,398	0.1600	1.8548	8,867	139%		
1982	939	42%	547	392	35	357		1,241	302	yes	na	no							39,988	6,398	0.1600	1.9288	9,340	146%		
1983	877	42%	509	368	39	330		1,229	351	yes	na	no							39,988	6,398	0.1600	1.9122	8,734	137%		
1984	843	41%	494	350	41	309		1,199	356	yes	na	no							39,988	6,398	0.1600	1.8445	8,301	130%		
1985	841	43%	478	363	41	322		1,181	340	yes	na	no				4		5%	42,000	6,720	0.1600	1.8085	8,653	129%		
1986	924	40%	551	373	36	337		1,286	362	yes	na	no							42,000	6,720	0.1600	1.8486	8,923	133%		
1987	890	42%	513	376	28	348		1,228	338	yes	na	no							42,000	6,720	0.1600	1.8916	9,212	137%		
1988	1,305	41%	774	531	35	496		1,852	347	yes	na	no	77,500	cragin bank		3	70%	22%	54,000	8,640	0.1600	1.9266	13,146	152%		
1988	1,305	41%	774	531	35	496		1,852	347	yes	na	no	101,500	seller, no buyer					54,000	8,640	0.1600	1.9266	13,146	152%		
1989	1,344	42%	779	566	33	533		1,706	361	yes	na	no							54,000	8,640	0.1600	1.9133	13,031	151%		
1990	1,384	44%	768	616	33	583		1,737	353	yes	na	no	105,000	nw home equity insurance			51%		54,000	8,640	0.1600	1.9946	13,733	159%		
1991	1,698	47%	899	799	37	762		2,121	423	yes	na	no				3 (1)		21%	68,668	10,987	0.1600	2.0523	18,049	164%		
1992	1,763	47%	940	823	35	788		2,192	430	yes	na	no	115,000	realtor market analysis			60%		68,669	10,987	0.1600	2.0897	18,460	168%		
1993	1,803	47%	952	851	29	822		2,230	427	yes	na	no	138,100	insure replace house only					68,669	10,987	0.1600	2.1407	19,020	173%		
1994	1,761	48%	923	839	50	789		2,180	419	yes	na	no	144,900	insure replace house only	1 story, 73 years			1%	69,269	11,083	0.1600	2.1135	18,924	171%		
1995	1,788	48%	922	866	56	810		2,210	422	yes	na	no							69,269	11,083	0.1600	2.1243	19,044	172%		
1996	1,837	49%	943	893	56	837		2,264	427	yes	na	no	152,700	insure replace house only					69,269	11,083	0.1600	2.1517	19,347	175%		
1997	1,900	49%	967	932	58	875		2,299	399	yes	na	no	159,300	insure replace house only	1 story, 76 years			8%	75,375	12,060	0.1600	2.1489	21,416	178%		
1998	1,937	50%	970	967	58	909		2,337	400	yes	na	no	162,500	lasalle bank/ insurance				46%	75,375	12,060	0.1600	2.1799	26,200	218%		
1999	1,936	51%	950	987	58	929		2,321	385	yes	na	no	166,900	insure replace house only					75,375	12,060	0.1600	2.2505	27,141	225%		
2000	2,447	50%	1,213	1,235	70	1,165		2,892	445	yes	yes	no	172,100	insure replace house only	1 or 1.5-1.9, 79 years (2)			28%	104,181	16,669	0.1600	2.2235	37,064	222%		
2001	2,415	52%	1,171	1,244	70	1,174		2,964	549	4500 (1)	2637 (1)	no	174,600	insure replace house only					104,181	16,669	0.1600	2.3098	38,502	231%		
2002	2,285	51%	1,112	1,173	56	1,117		2,998	713	yes	yes	no	184,000	insure replace house only					104,181	16,669	0.1600	2.4689	41,154	247%		
2003	2,401	51%	1,173	1,228	56	1,172	(2)	3,636	1,235	yes	na	no	197,100	insure replace house only	1 or 1.5-1.9, 82 years (2)			27%	143,469	22,955	0.1600	2.4598	56,465	246%		
2004	2,507	52%	1,198	1,309	71	1,238		3,716	1,209	yes	na	no	264,000	nw home equity insurance (1)				54%	143,469	22,955	0.1600	2.5757	59,125	258%		
2005	2,557	53%	1,210	1,347	54	1,293		3,754	1,197	yes	na	no	220,400	insure replace house only					143,469	22,955	0.1600	2.7320	62,713	273%		
2006	2,877	53%	1,351	1,526	64	1,462		5,000	2,122	yes	na	no	249,000	insure replace house only (2)	1 or 1.5-1.9, 85 years (2)			34%	217,500	34,800	0.1600	2.7076	94,224	271%		
2007	2,443	54%	1,136	1,307	44	1,262	(3) (2008)	4,946	2,504	yes	na	no	247,800	insure replace house only					217,500	34,800	0.1600	2.8439	98,968	284%		
2008	2,521	53%	1,175	1,346	0	1,293	53	4,996	2,476	yes	na	no	205,300	insure replace house only					217,500	34,800	0.1600	2.9786	103,655	298%		
2009	2,591	54%	1,205	1,387	0	1,324	63	5,095	2,504	yes	na	no	216,000	insure replace house only	1 or 1.5-1.9, 88 years (2)			3 (4)(5)(6)	151%	50%	326,460	32,646	0.1000	3.3701	110,020	337%
2010													150,000	reverse mortgage lender				218%								
					(1) total school tax is unclear because tax bill lists two related line items separately.					(1) tax bill lists exemption calculated on EAV instead of gross tax.			(1) 1.5 story, 81 years											(1) \$1 difference in tax bill and reassessment notice.		
					(2) total school tax is somewhat clear because tax bill lists two related line items together.								(2) 1.5 story											(2) discrepancy in property class (1 story) and building type (1.5-1.9 stories).		
																								(3) 2006 notice mailed July instead of November to value properties ahead of deflation.		
																								(4) market value omitted.		
																								(5) 6% decrease in Cook Co. multiplier hides alleged market value increase when selling prices have actually deflated since prior reassessment (and houses deteriorate with age).		
					(3) 2008 total school tax is unclear because tax bill lists three line items in two different categories.																			(6) variability of Cook Co. multiplier combined with variable and rising EAV can lead to unconscionable inflation of property tax in violation of intent of tax cap provision in 1970 Illinois constitution.		