

THE SELECTIVE REASSESSMENT OF REAL PROPERTY IN NEW YORK STATE

March 20, 2007

By Justice Thomas A. Dickerson¹

I spent nearly four years presiding over the Tax Certiorari and Condemnation Law Part of New York State's 9th Judicial District which covers Westchester, Putnam, Rockland, Dutchess and Orange Counties [" 9th J.D. Tax Cert Part "]. The 9th J.D. Tax Cert Part manages numerous matters seeking, amongst other forms of relief, exemptions from real property taxes, reductions in real property tax assessments and the resolution of a variety of eminent domain issues including valuation. The 9th J.D. Tax Cert Part also has a website¹ which contains Part rules & calendar²

Thomas A. Dickerson is an Associate Justice of the Appellate Division, Second Department of the New York State Supreme Court who formerly presided over the Tax Certiorari & Condemnation Law Part of the 9th Judicial District. Justice Dickerson is the author of Class Actions: The Law of 50 States, Law Journal Press, N.Y., 2007; Travel Law, Law Journal Press, N.Y., 2007; Article 9 of 3 Weinstein, Korn & Miller, New York Civil Practice CPLR (2005, 2006) and over 240 legal articles, many of which are available at www.classactionlitigation.com/library/ca_articles.html and www.consumerlaw.org/links/#travel_articles

procedures, downloadable decisions, articles, publications and important links.

Types Of Property

The issues raised in the 9th J.D. Tax Cert Part, particularly, valuation and exemption issues, and the way in which they are analyzed and resolved have much to do with the type of real property in dispute. For example, the following types of real property have come before us within the context of trials and/or motions in either tax certiorari or eminent domain proceedings: two electricity generating power plants³, one, oil and gas fired⁴, the other, primarily, coal fired⁵ [59 day trial], farmland including residence, barn and shed⁶, a continuing care retirement community⁷ [74 day trial], a " home for the elderly " ⁸, a senior housing complex⁹, an Adult Home¹⁰, a branch bank¹¹, single family residences¹² including eleven town house style structures¹³, apartment complexes¹⁴, condominiums¹⁵, shopping centers¹⁶, vacant land¹⁷, office buildings¹⁸, contaminated industrial property¹⁹, a burned down bowling alley²⁰, a luncheonette²¹ and various other commercial properties²².

Tax Exemptions

With respect to entities seeking an exemption from real property taxes we have examined a cellular telephone tower²³, a Free Loan Society²⁴, a STAR exemption²⁵, a continuing care retirement community²⁶, an adult home²⁷, property owned by a religious order²⁸, The Salvation & Praise Deliverance Center²⁹, residences for clergy³⁰ and cultural organizations³¹.

Some Procedural Issues

We have also addressed a number of procedural issues involving the interpretation and application of 22 NYCRR § 202.59 to tax certiorari³² matters and 22 NYCRR § 202.61 to eminent domain proceedings³³, the proper scope of discovery in tax certiorari and eminent domain proceedings³⁴, admissibility of evidence of condemnation advance payments at trial³⁵, the proper service of tax certiorari petitions³⁶ and whether taxpayers are required to permit appraisers to perform interior inspections³⁷.

Selective Reassessment vs. Annual Reassessment

The selective reassessment of real property is a recurring issue in tax certiorari proceedings in New York State courts, particularly, in the 9th Judicial District³⁸. It may be, as suggested by one commentator³⁹, that the incidence of selective

reassessment, at least, to the extent it involves reassessment to market on sale, is relatively rare in Nassau County and New York City because those taxing authorities " annually reassess all parcels (and hence) [r]eassessment on sale is thus permissible as part of these broader reassessment programs "40. In the 9th Judicial District, however, only a few smaller municipalities in 2005⁴¹ were in the New York State Office of Real Property Services' [ORPS] annual reassessment program [now referred to as "Guidelines for the Annual Aid Program"⁴²], i.e., Pelham and the Town of Rye in Westchester County; Kent, Patterson, Southeast and Putnam Valley in Putnam County and Milan, Northeast, Red Hook and Rhinebeck in Dutchess County.

Another community in Westchester County, the Village of Bronxville, approved a villagewide revaluation " aimed at making property taxes fair and equitable and ending widespread tax discrepancies "43 and which has " put an estimated \$800 million of real estate on the books increasing the village's tax base by a third "44. The Village of Bronxville had previously initiated two studies⁴⁵, the results of which are available on the Village's website⁴⁶. The studies [Wilkes, A Legal Analysis of Assessment Practices and Property Tax Equity in the Village of Bronxville, September 12, 2005⁴⁷ and Eckert, Assessment Practices and Effective Tax Rate Variations in Bronxville, September 8, 2005⁴⁸] provide a valuable resource for communities interested

in revaluation.

Annual Reassessment Programs

The ORPS annual reassessment program is based upon R.P.T.L. § 1573⁴⁹ and, according to ORPS, the advantages of participating in the program include achieving assessment equity for taxpayers, local control over the equalization rate, improved bond ratings, fewer court challenges to assessments and increased land assessments⁵⁰. Generally, the ORPS program has been well received⁵¹ and has been implemented by many municipalities⁵². In addition, such a program implies that arms-length, representative sales may be reassessed, using as one factor, the sales prices of the subject property and comparable properties in the neighborhood " so long as the implicit policy is applied even-handedly to all similarly situated property "'⁵³. This would seem to apply to the initial assessment of newly created property⁵⁴, as well. In any event, because so few municipalities in the 9th Judicial District participate in an annual reassessment program, tax certiorari cases alleging selective reassessment are more likely to arise.

What Is Selective Reassessment?

The policy of selective reassessment has been found by the U.S. Supreme Court and New York Courts to be a violation of the equal protection clause of both the United States Constitution and the New York State Constitution. But what exactly is selective reassessment? Generally, selective reassessment involves discrimination and a violation of equal protection [See e.g., Allegheny Pittsburgh Coal Co. v. County Commission of Webster County⁵⁵ (" The Equal Protection Clause ` applies only to taxation which in fact bears unequally on persons or property of the same class `...As long as general adjustments are accurate enough over a short period of time to equalize the differences in proportion between the assessments of a class of property holders, the Equal Protection Clause is satisfied...[I]t does not require immediate general adjustment on the basis of the latest market developments. In each case, the constitutional requirement is the reasonable attainment of a rough equality in tax treatment of similarly situated property owners "); Corvetti v. Town of Lake Pleasant⁵⁶ (" We reach the same conclusion with regard to plaintiffs' 42 USC § 1983 equal protection claim since their allegation that ` it was the official policy of [defendants] to assess property pursuant to a ` welcome neighbor ` policy of arbitrarily increasing the assessments of new residents of the town..."); Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors⁵⁷ (" It has also been held that ` gross disparities ` in the taxation

of similarly situated taxpayers can constitute a violation of the constitutional right to equal protection of the laws...if a classification between taxpayers is palpably arbitrary or involved an invidious discrimination, an equal protection violation will be found "); Nash v. Assessor of Town of Southampton⁵⁸ (" a tax classification will only violate constitutional equal protection guarantees ` if the distinction between the classes is ` palpably arbitrary ` or amounts to ` invidious discrimination ` ")].

Specific Forms Of Selective Reassessment

Selective reassessment takes many forms and has also been referred to as " reassessment upon sale "⁵⁹, " improper assessment "⁶⁰ or " reassessment on sale only...or selective under-valuation...or selective neighborhood reassessment "⁶¹.

Reassessment Upon Sale At Market Rate

First, selective reassessment may involve reassessing individual properties at market rate when they are sold [See e.g., Matter of Charles Krugman v. Board of Assessors of the

Village of Atlantic Beach⁶² (" The respondents' practice of selective reassessment of only those properties in the village which were sold during the prior year contravenes statutory and constitutional mandates. In order to achieve uniformity and ensure that each property owner is paying an equitable share of the total tax burden the assessors, at a minimum, were required to review all property on the tax rolls in order to assess the properties at a uniform percentage of their market value. The respondents' disparate treatment of new property owners on the one hand and long term property owners on the other has the effect of permitting property owners who have been longstanding recipients of public amenities to bear the least amount of their cost... This approach lacks any rational basis in law and results in invidious discrimination between owners of similarly situated property "); Matter of Stern v. City of Rye⁶³ (" However, rather than adding the value of the improvement to the prior assessment...the properties were reassessed to a comparable market value that included the value of the improvement..."); Matter of Feldman v. Assessor of Town of Bedford⁶⁴ (" The petitioner also claims that the challenged assessment was part of a systematic endeavor by the respondents to reassess only those properties in the town that were sold "); Incorporated Village of Southampton v. Noa⁶⁵ (" Reduced to its simplest terms, it appears that the attack is focused on appraisal methodology

rather than legal or illegal methodologies, such as reassessment on sale only [Krugman v. Board of Assessors⁶⁶] or selective under-valuation [Allegheny Pittsburgh Coal Co. v. County Commissioners⁶⁷] or selective neighborhood reassessment [Adams v. Welch⁶⁸] "); Kardos v. Ryan⁶⁹ (" Petitioners alleged that respondent selectively reassessed their property solely because it was newly purchased, an improper practice "; selective reassessment found); Matter of DeLeonardis v. City of Mount Vernon⁷⁰ (" utilizing the recent purchase price as a basis for determining the increase in assessed value of property on which improvements have been made pursuant to building permits, while similarly situated properties which have not been improved are not subject to reassessment, results in discriminatory treatment of the petitioner by imposing upon him a tax burden not imposed upon owners of similarly situated property "); Feigert v. Assessor of the Town of Bedford⁷¹ (" The petitioners herein have offered substantial proof that the 1991 assessment of their property is based directly upon the resale of the property in 1983 "); Schwaneer v. Town of Canandaigua⁷² (" the petition sets forth specific examples of gross disparities in the assessed value of allegedly comparable property "); Matter of Reszin Adams v. Welch⁷³ (" respondent's ` selective reassessment ` was not rationally based and therefore was improper "); Matter of Averbach v. Board of Assessors⁷⁴ (allegations that " assessments

were made pursuant to an illegal ' welcome stranger ' assessment procedure "); Gray v. Huonker⁷⁵ (house selectively reassessed " that was not based on a policy ' applied evenhandedly to all similarly situated property within the [jurisdiction] ' "); Matter of Markim v. The Town of Orangetown⁷⁶ (selective reassessment found).

High Coefficients Of Dispersion

Second, a high coefficient of dispersion⁷⁷ may be a sign of selective reassessment⁷⁸ [See e.g., Waccabuc Construction Corp. v. Assessor of Town of Lewisboro⁷⁹(" A high coefficient of dispersion indicates a high degree of variance with respect to the assessment ratios under consideration. A low coefficient of dispersion indicates a low degree of variance. In other words, a low coefficient of dispersion indicates that the parcels under consideration are being assessed at close to an equal rate (see 9 NYCRR 185-4.4) "); Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors⁸⁰].

Condominium Conversions

Third, an increase in assessment based solely on the conversion of a 150 residential apartment complex to a condominium may involve selective reassessment [See e.g., Matter of Towne House Village Condominium v. Assessor of the Town of Islip⁸¹ (" Such an increase in assessment is prohibited by statute [R.P.T.L. § 339-y[1][b]; R.P.T.L. 581]. Even were the assessor not prohibited from assigning a higher assessment ...there was no rational basis in law for reassessing only the subject property. Such a ` selective reassessment ` is improper as a denial of equal protection guarantees ")].

Reassessments Based On More Than Value Of Improvements

Fourth, reassessments based on more than the value of subsequent improvements to an existing structure may involve selective reassessment [See e.g., Matter of Stern v. City of Rye⁸² (" reassessment upon improvement is not illegal in and of itself. Here, the petitioners' properties were reassessed after recent improvement. However, rather than adding the value of the improvement to the prior assessment...the properties were reassessed to a comparable market value that included the value of the improvement..."); Kardos v. Ryan⁸³ (reassessment of " entire property " based upon assessor's discovery of a " large porch on the rear of (taxpayer's) home " unsupported by

evidence; selective reassessment found); Kaminsky v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining⁸⁴ (assessor's methodology of updating and correcting inventory data with respect to tax parcels and reassessing based upon an estimate of the value of the improvements reasonable but assessments vacated for failing to verify the existence of and value of the improvements identified in MLS listing); AKW Holdings LLC v. Assessor of the Town of Clarkstown⁸⁵ (assessment methodology for reassessing properties (but not within the context of a Town wide revaluation program) to bring them ' in line with the assessed value of other similar properties in the Town of Clarkstown held to be selective reassessment and unconstitutional; assessment vacated; new assessment ordered); Matter of Villemena v. City of Mount Vernon⁸⁶ (no selective reassessment found; new assessment ordered); Parisi v. Assessor of the Town of Southampton⁸⁷ (no selective reassessment found); McCready v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining⁸⁸ (no selective reassessment found); Matter of Bock v. Assessor of the Town/Village of Scarsdale⁸⁹ (assessor presented facially reasonable explanation for changing assessments on real property based upon the cost of improvements which appears to be fair and comprehensive; no selective reassessment found); Teja v. The Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh⁹⁰ (" Petitioners' argument, briefly stated, is that the only allowable increase in valuation above the assessment of

June 1, 2001 could be one based solely on the addition of the kitchen appliances, which cost \$14,513.28. Anything more than this they contend is a ' welcome stranger ' increase based on the purchase price of \$1,175,000.00 paid in April 2002. (There was no town-wide reassessment of all similarly situated properties.). This valuation technique is unconstitutional because it is a selective reassessment which denies equal protection guarantees "); Carter v. The City of Mount Vernon⁹¹ (assessment increased 48.9% after sale based upon " ' certain improvements ' having been made to the property, without proper permits, by the prior owner " ; assessor failed to " even identify, or enumerate just what specific renovations or improvements " were made; assessment held invalid); Joan Dale Young v. The Town of Bedford⁹² (" the prohibition against reassessment of improved property ' utilizing the recent purchase price as a basis for determining the increase in assessed value of a property on which improvements have been made ' (does not apply) to the initial assessment of newly created property on vacant, unimproved land ")].

The Initial Assessment Of Newly Created Property

Some Courts have permitted, in the absence of a " comprehensive revaluation of all real property in town " ⁹³, assessors to assess newly created property at market [See e.g.,

Markim v. Assessor of the Town of Orangetown, 11 Misc. 3d 1063 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(" Newly created property such as the subject eleven properties may be initially assessed at or near market value "); MGD Holdings Hav, LLC v. Assessor of the Town of Haverstraw, 2006 WL 398305 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(" The subject property consists of a newly built apartment complex of nine buildings containing 168 rentable units, a clubhouse and caretaker's residence, all located at 1101-9408 Crystal Hill Drive, Town of Haverstraw... Since the subject property is newly created property it may be assessed, upon its completion, at or close to market "); Joan Dale Young v. The Town of Bedford, 9 Misc. 3d 1115(A)(West. 2005)(" it is appropriate on the initial assessment of newly created property for an Assessor to consider, among other factors, [and " so long as the implicit policy is applied even-handedly to all similarly situated property "'⁹⁴] " the current market value (of the newly created property and of comparable properties in the Town of Bedford) to reach a tax assessment "⁹⁵), aff'd 2007 WL 530575 (2d Dept. 2007)] while other Courts have found this procedure to be yet another example of selective reassessment [James Montgomery v. Board of Assessment Review of the Town of Union⁹⁶ ("...petitioners claim that the Town Assessor uses current market values to assess newly constructed homes but not older existing residential properties, thus creating two different classes of

residential properties that are treated differently for purposes of taxation. It is well settled that all real property within a taxing unit must be assessed at a uniform percentage of value, and, regardless of the methodology adopted by the Assessor, the result must reflect the realistic value of the property so that the tax burden of each property is equitable...Respondents do not dispute petitioners' contentions regarding the method of assessment of newly constructed residences within the Town and assert that such method is permissible and does not constitute 'selective assessment'... Petitioners have adequately stated a viable claim and presented evidence which creates significant material issues of fact which should be resolved at trial "); Wilson v. Dziedzic⁹⁷ (" Reassessment of properties that have been improved is not improper; indeed, it would be unfair to other property owners to continue to tax property that has been improved without taking into account the additional value added. Nor is it wrong, as a general proposition, to use current market value to determine property assessments...What is unacceptable, however, is precisely what has occurred here-using one procedure, based on current market value, to assess only newly improved properties, while other, comparable properties within the assessing unit, which have not recently improved, carry assessments calculated by using another, more favorable method. It has been held that such a distinction between similar

properties, solely on the ground that some have been recently improved, serves no legitimate governmental interest ")].

No Equal Protection Violations

And lastly there have been cases in which the issue of selective reassessment has been raised but no equal protection violations have been found or the case was remanded for trial [See e.g., Nash v. Assessor of Town of Southampton⁹⁸ (" Whether the delay in the implementation of a comprehensive reassessment of all of the parcels in a taxing jurisdiction can result in equal protection violation...it cannot be said, on the present record, that the Town acted in bad faith...")], the reassessment of 150 waterfront parcels because of " the rapid rate of appreciation of property " [See e.g., Mundinger v. Assessor of the City of Rye⁹⁹ (" The reassessment program... would be justified...if waterfront residential property appreciated at a higher rate than nonwaterfront residential property ")], the use of two different methods of assessing Class I property [See e.g., Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors¹⁰⁰(" Indeed, it is well settled that a system of assessment which is challenged on the ground of inequality may nevertheless survive judicial scrutiny if the assessing authority demonstrates that the classification which results in unequal treatment bears a

rational relation to the achievement of a legitimate governmental objective ")], the reclassification of Class II property to Class I property [See e.g., Matter of Acorn Ponds v. Board of Assessors¹⁰¹ (" There is no proof in the record that the failure to reassess all Class I property when the petitioner's property was reassessed resulted in disparate tax treatment of a constitutional dimension ")]; the method of dividing " the Town into four neighborhoods for valuation purposes " [See e.g., Matter of Akerman v. Assessor of Town of Hardenburg¹⁰² (petitioners have not established that the formulas used by respondents were improper or inequitable or that the assessments violate constitutional requirements ")]; and the methodology for partially assessing real property [See e.g., Matter of MGD Holdings v. Town of Haverstraw¹⁰³ (motion for summary judgment denied; fact issues to be resolved at trial); Matter of Markim v. Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh¹⁰⁴ (partial assessments appropriate upon notice to taxpayers)].

Conclusion

The issues raised in the tax certiorari, tax exemption and condemnation law areas are exciting, indeed, and of considerable importance to municipal taxing authorities and real property tax payers.

ENDNOTES

1. www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/taxcert.shtml
2. Calendar information is available www.courts.state.ny.us.
3. See e.g., Matter of Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. v. Assessor of the Town of Haverstraw 4 Misc. 3d 1005(A)(Rockland Sup. 2004); 5 Misc. 3d 1010(A) (Rockland Sup. 2004); 7 Misc. 3d 1017(A)(Rockland Sup. 2005).
4. Matter of Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. v. Southern Energy Bolwine, LLC, 12 Misc. 3d 1194 (Rockland Sup. 2006) (post trial decision on valuation; income [DCF] approach rejected; comparable sales approach rejected; reproduction cost new less depreciation approach accepted).
5. Mirant New York, Inc. v. Town of Stony Point Assessors, 13 Misc. 3d 1204 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(post trial decision on valuation; income [DCF] approach rejected; comparable sales approach rejected; reproduction cost new less depreciation approach accepted).
6. Johnson v. Kelly, Assessor of the Town of Goshen, 11 Misc. 3d 1081 (Orange Sup. 2006).
7. Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 11 Misc. 3d 1065 (West. Sup. 2006) (admissibility of hotel appraisals); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 11 Misc. 3d 1059 (West. Sup. 2006)(admissibility of documents downloaded from the New York State Department of Health and the U.S. government medicare websites); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home

Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, (Misc. 3d 1019, 800 N.Y.S. 2d 909 (2005) (admissibility of an ORPS Salesweb data compilation); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 8 Misc. 3d 1008 (West. Sup. 2005) (motion to quash trial subpoena for accountant's work papers); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 7 Misc. 3d 1004 (West. Sup. 2005) (admissibility of testimony of a Law Professor); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, No: 17175/97, Slip Op. April 7, 2005 (admissibility of ancient documents); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 6 Misc. 3d 1035, 800 N.Y.S. 2d 350 (2005) (burden of proof regarding restoration of hospital exemption under RPTL § 420-a); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, No. 17175/97, Slip Op. February 3, 2005 (burden of proof regarding restoration of charitable use exemption under RPTL 420-a); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 6 Misc. 3d 1011 (West. Sup. 2005) (motion to preclude evidence of resident health); Miriam Osborn Memorial Home Association v. The Assessor of the City of Rye, 4 Misc. 3d 1009 (West. Sup. 2004) (scope of appraisal audit pursuant to 22 NYCRR § 202.59[©]).

8. Matter of 325 Highland LLC v. Assessor of the City of Mount Vernon, 5 Misc. 3d 1018(A) (West. Sup. 2004) (recent purchase price in arm's length transaction best measure of true value of property).

9. Matter of Nyack Plaza Housing Association v. Town of Orangetown, 7 Misc. 3d 1011(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005) (motion to preclude respondent from introducing evidence at trial of assessment class ratio granted; assessor required to assess all properties within its boundaries at a single, uniform overall percentage of value).

10. Adult Home at Erie Station v. Assessor of the City of Middletown, 8 Misc. 3d 1010(A) (Orange Sup. 2005) (on appeal). Compare: Matter of Jamil v. Village of Scarsdale Planning Board, 4 Misc. 3d 642, 778 N.Y.S. 2d 670 (2004), aff'd 24 A.D. 2d 552, ___N.Y.S. 2d___ (2d Dept. 2005) (planning board's approval of assisted living facility as special use in residential district upheld).

11. Matter of The Bank of New York v. Assessor of the Village of Bronxville, 4 Misc. 3d 1014(A) (West. Sup. 2004) (motion for mistrial granted due to illness of expert witness).

12. Kaminsky v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining, 2006 WL 1628978 (West. Sup. 2006)(no selective reassessment found but assessments vacated nonetheless because assessor failed to verify existence of and value of improvements identified in MLS listing); McCready v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining, 11 Misc. 3d 1086 (West. Sup. 2006)(new assessment ordered; plan for updating inventory of tax parcels reasonable; no selective reassessment found); Matter of Bock v. Assessor of the Town/Village of Scarsdale, 2006 WL 328503 (West. Sup. 2006)(motion for summary judgment denied; no selective reassessment found); Matter of Villamena v. City of Mount Vernon, 7 Misc. 3d 1020(A) (West. Sup. 2005)(new inspection and assessment ordered of residence; no selective reassessment found); Matter of Falbe v. Tax Assessor of the Town of Cornwall, 8 Misc. 3d 1004(A) (Orange Sup. 2005)(order directing village to pay tax refund vacated because of misrepresentations); Matter of Dale Joan Young v. Town of Bedford, 9 Misc. 3d 1107(A) (West. Sup. 2005)(use of current market value for initial assessment of newly created property; no selective reassessment found), **aff'd** 2007 WL 530575 (2d Dept. 2007).

13. Matter of Markim v. Assessor of the Town of Orangetown, 9 Misc. 3d 1115(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(assessor failed to adequately explain assessment methodology; selective reassessment found), **mod'd** 11 Misc. 3d 1063(A) (Rockland Sup. 2006).

14. Earla Associates v. Board of Assessors of City of Middletown, 2006 WL 3525672 (Orange Sup. 2006)(post trial decision on valuation of apartment complex); Redhead Properties, LLC v. Town of Wappinger, 2006 WL 1274077 (Dutchess Sup. 2006)(consent judgment enforced pursuant to RPTL 727(1); RPTL 727(2)(a) (valuation) and 727(2)(I) (change in use) not applicable; additional allowances per RPTL 722(2) awarded); Matter of MGD Holdings Hav, LLV v. Assessor of the Town of Haverstraw, 8 Misc. 3d 1013(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motion for summary judgment denied) & 11 Misc 3d 1054(A)(Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion to reargue granted and upon reargument earlier decision adhered to).

15. Matter of Blueberry Hill Condominium v. Town of Ramapo, 12 Misc. 3d 1160 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(county bound by express terms of settlement to pay interest on money judgment).

16. Matter of VGR Associates, LLC v. Assessor of the Town of New Windsor, 2006 WL 2851618 (Orange Sup. 2006)(post trial decision on valuation of shopping center); Matter of Midway Shopping Center v. Town of Greenburgh, 11 Misc. 3d 1071 (West. Sup. 2006).

17. Village of Irvington v. Sokolik, 13 Misc. 3d 1220 (West. Sup. 2006)(condemnation proceedings; post trial decision on highest and best use valuation of .195 acres of vacant land used by condemnor for construction of a salt shed).

18. Matter of JB Park Place Realty LLC v. Assessor of Village of Bronxville, 13 Misc. 3d 1233 (West. Sup. 2006)(arm's length sale of commercial building at \$1,325,000 best evidence of value); Matter of AKW Holdings LLC v. Assessor of the Town of Clarkstown, 12 Misc. 3d 1160 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(selective reassessment of commercial building containing medical imaging company); (Matter of Reckson Operating Partnership LP v. The Town of Greenburgh, 2 Misc. 3d 1005(A) (West. Sup. 2004)(because purchasers of commercial buildings buy an " income stream " the income capitalization approach is the best method of determining value); Matter of 2 Perlman Drive v. Board of Assessors of Village of Spring Valley, 9 Misc. 3d 382, 800 N.Y.S. 2d 816 (Orange Sup. 2005)(R.P.T.L. § 727(1) Moratorium; two exceptions reviewed); Matter of MRE Realty Corp. v. Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh, 8 Misc. 3d 1027(A) (West. Sup. 2005)(R.P.T.L. § 727(1) Moratorium; failure to timely file).

19. Matter of D'Onofrio v. Village of Port Chester, 8 Misc. 3d 1015(A) (West. Sup. 2005)(claimant's motion to exclude evidence at trial as to any diminution in the value of the property by reason of cleanup or remediation costs resulting from alleged environmental contamination granted).

20. Matter of SKM Enterprises, Inc. v. The Town of Monroe, 2 Misc. 3d 1004(A) (Orange Sup. 2004)(petitioner's recycled 1996 appraisal submitted at the trial of 1997 tax assessment challenge stricken and 1997 petition dismissed).

21. Matter of the Village of Port Chester, 10 Misc. 3d 1057(A) (West. Sup. 2005)(claim dismissed as abandoned).

22. Matter of the Village of Port Chester, 5 Misc. 3d 1031(A) (West. Sup. 2004)(condemnor ordered to pay advance payments into an escrow account pending outcome of condemnee's federal appeal in action challenging the condemnation proceeding on due process grounds; condemnor ordered to pay statutory interest of 6% on the advance payments); AAA Electricians, Inc. v. Village of Haverstraw, 9 Misc. 3d 1120(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motion seeking order directing condemnor to tender the remaining balance of the advance payment denied pursuant to E.D.P.L. § 304(F)).

23. Matter of Nextel of New York v. Assessor of the Village of Spring Valley, 4 Misc. 3d 233, 771 N.Y.S. 2d 853 (2004)(Nextel's telecommunications equipment taxable as real property pursuant to R.P.T.L. § 102(12)(I) or as common law fixtures).

24. Matter of Gemilas Chasudim Keren Eluzer Inc. v. Assessor of the Town of Ramapo, 5 Misc. 3d 1026(A) (Rockland Sup. 2004) (R.P.T.L. § 420-1(1)(a); although property was owned by tax exempt organization it was not used primarily for the charitable activities of the society).

25. Matter of Brodie v. Office of the Assessor, 8 Misc. 3d 1001(A)(Rockland Sup. 2005)(claim for STAR tax exemption barred by statute of limitations).

26. Matter of Osborn Memorial Home Association v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 4 Misc. 3d 1009(A) (West. Sup. 2004); 6 Misc. 3d 1011(A); 6 Misc. 3d 1035(A) (West. Sup. 2005); 7 Misc. 3d 1004(A) (West. Sup. 2005); 8 Misc. 3d 1008(A) (West. Sup. 2005); 9 Misc. 3d 1019, 800 N.Y.S. 2d 909 (West. Sup. 2005); 11 Misc. 3d 1059(A) (West. Sup. 2006); 11 Misc. 3d 1065(A) (West. Sup. 2006).

27. Adult Home at Erie Station v. Assessor of the City of Middletown, 8 Misc. 3d 1010(A) (Orange Sup. 2005)(request for tax exemption pursuant to RPTL § 420-1(1)(a) denied), rev'd 36 A.D. 2d 699, 828 N.Y.S. 2d 459 (2d Dept. 2007).

28.

Matter of Foreclosure of Tax Liens by Town of Mount Pleasant, Index No: 03-11004,(West. Sup. March 8, 2004) available at www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/TacCert_pdfs/legionofchrist.pdf (motion to stay Town of Mount Pleasant's tax lien enforcement proceeding denied; taxpayers required to pay a disputed tax prior to challenging the propriety of the tax in a court proceeding).

29. Matter of Salvation & Praise Deliverance Center v. The City of Poughkeepsie, 6 Misc. 3d 1021(A) (Dutchess Sup. 2005)(bar claim action granted; R.P.T.L. Article 7 petition dismissed as moot).

30. Congregation Or Yosef v. Town of Ramapo, 13 Misc. 3d 1214 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(post trial decision on application for real property tax exemption under RPTL §§ 420(a),(b), 462; no standing because of violations of zoning code); Khal Bais Shmiel v. Assessor of Town of Ramapo, 13 Misc. 3d 1215 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(failure to present credible evidence for granting tax

exemption pursuant to RPTL § 420(a)); Jewish Inspiration, Inc. v. Assessor of Town of Ramapo, 2006 WL 1594476 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(summary judgment denied; material issues of fact include what portion of property is actually used in carrying out religious, charitable or educational purposes); Matter of Congregation Knesset Israel v. Assessor of Town of Ramapo, 8 Misc. 3d 1021(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motions for summary judgment denied; synagogue seeks tax exemption for residence in which rabbi resides; whether rabbi full time officiant or a part-time clergyman must be resolved at trial); Matter of Congregation Sherith Yisoel Vilednki v. Town of Ramapo, 5 Misc. 3d 1027(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motion seeking permission to depose the Tax Assessor denied).

31. Otrada, Inc., American Russian Aid Association v. Assessor of the Town of Ramapo, 9 Misc. 3d 1116(A)(Rockland Sup. 2005) (assessor reduced 100% tax exemption to 67%; 100% tax exemption for 2003 restored); mod'd 11 Misc. 3d 1058(A) (Rockland Sup. 2006).

32. Matter of Rose Mount Vernon Corp. v. Assessor of the City of Mount Vernon, 1 Misc. 3d 906(A) (West. Sup. 2003), aff'd 15 A.D. 3d 585, 791 N.Y.S. 2d 572 (2d Dept. 2005)(notes of issue for 1996 through 2002 vacated pursuant to 22 NYCRR § 202.21(e) and tax assessment review proceedings for 1996 through 1999 dismissed for failure to file income and expense statements with Westchester County Clerk pursuant to 22 NYCRR §§ 202.59(b),(d)(1)); Matter of Osborn Memorial Home Association v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 4 Misc. 3d 1009(A) (West. Sup. 2004)(discovery of petitioner's balance sheets for all years in question to aid in 22 NYCRR § 202.59© audit granted); Matter of Midway Shopping Center v. Town of Greenburgh, 2006 WL 820261 (West. Sup. 2006) (notes of issue and petitions dismissed; lack of authority and standing and failure to comply with 22 NYCRR §§ 202.59(b), (d)(1)).

33. Matter of Rockland County Sewer District No. 1, 9 Misc. 3d 1106(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(note of issue and certificate of readiness dismissed for failure to exchange trial appraisals pursuant to 22 NYCRR § 202.61(a)(1)).

34. Matter of Rockland County Sewer District, 13 Misc. 3d 1226 (Rockland Sup. 2006).

35. Matter of Village of Spring Valley, 2006 NYSlipOp 51940 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(evidence of condemnation advance payments not admissible at trial).

36. See e.g., Matter of Landesman v. Whitton, 13 Misc. 3d 1216 (Dutchess Sup. 2006)(petitions dismissed for failure to comply with filing requirements of RPTL § 718(1) and service requirements of RPTL § 708(3)); Matter of Allstate Equities, LLC v. Town of Newburgh, 2006 WL 1290699 (Orange Sup. 2006) (failure to provide a complete return date on tax certiorari petition is a jurisdictional defect); Majaars Realty Association v. Town of Poughkeepsie, 10 Misc. 3d 1061(A) (Dutchess Sup. 2005)(petition dismissed for failure to serve the superintendent of schools pursuant to R.P.T.L. § 708(3)); Matter of 275 N. Middletown Road v. Kenny, 10 Misc. 3d 1067(A)(Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion to dismiss petition pursuant to R.P.T.L. § 708(3) denied; service on secretary to superintendent of schools sufficient; no prejudice shown); Matter of Commerce Drive Associates v. Board of Assessment Review, 10 Misc. 3d 1071(A) (Orange Sup. 2005)(motion to dismiss petition pursuant to R.P.T.L. § 702(2) for improperly serving Town of Waywayanda instead of Town of Woodbury denied; no prejudice shown); Matter of Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc., 2006 WL 297727 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion to dismiss petition pursuant to RPTL § 708(3) for failure to serve superintendent of schools granted).

37. Schlesinger v. Town of Ramapo, 807 N.Y.S. 2d 685 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion pursuant to 22 NYCRR § 202.59(e) to require taxpayer to permit an appraiser to do an interior inspection in order to complete a preliminary and trial ready appraisal denied; review of building permits on file would provide a reasonable alternative means of evaluating the interior of residence).

38. See e.g., Matter of Stern v. City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 100 (2d Dept. 2000)(selective reassessment); Matter of Feldman v. Assessor of Town of Bedford, 236 A.D. 2d 399, 653 N.Y.S. 2d 28 (2d Dept. 1997)(selective reassessment); Matter of DeLeonardis v. City of Mount Vernon, 226 A.D. 2d 530, 532, 641 N.Y.S. 2d 83 (2d Dept. 1996)(selective reassessment); Feigert v. Assessor of the Town of Bedford, 204 A.D. 2d 543, 544, 614 N.Y.S. 2d 200 (2d Dept. 1994)(selective reassessment); Matter of Bock v. Assessor of the Town/Village of Scarsdale, 2006 WL 328503 (West. Sup. 2006)(no selective reassessment found); Matter of Markim v. The Town of Orangetown, 6 Misc. 3d 1042(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005), 9 Misc. 3d 1115(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(selective reassessment), mod'd 11 Misc. 3d 1063(A) (Rockland Sup. 2006); Joan Dale Young v. The Town of Bedford, 9 Misc. 3d 1107(A)(West. Sup. 2005)(no selective reassessment); Matter of MGD Holdings v. Town of Haverstraw, 8 Misc. 3d 1013(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motion for summary judgment denied); 2006 WL 398305 (Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion to reargue granted and

upon reargument earlier decision adhered to); Matter of Villemena v. City of Mount Vernon, 7 Misc. 3d 1020(A)(West. Sup. 2005)(no selective reassessment); Carter v. The City of Mount Vernon, Index No: 19301/02, J. Rosato, Decision November 25, 2003 (selective reassessment); Teja v. The Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh, Index No: 14628/03, J. Rosato, Decision May 27, 2004 (selective reassessment).

39. Siegel, Reassessment on Sale, New York Law Journal, August 2, 2005, p. 16.

40. Siegel, Reassessment on Sale, New York Law Journal, August 2, 2005, p. 16.

41. See Sadler, Rye town prepares for Tax Grievance Day, The Journal News, June 18, 2006, p. 6A (" Before the revaluation, residents went years without receiving a change of assessment and properties were assessed at a fraction of their market value. But since the revaluation raised property assessments to their estimated market value for tax purposes, updating the assessment roll

42. ORPS Guidelines for the Annual Aid Program at <http://www.orps.state.ny.us/reassess/annualaid/overview.htm>

43. See e.g., Adely, Bronxville board Oks revaluation, The Journal News, March 14, 2006, p. 12A (" Revaluation is the only viable option to restore equity in our tax rolls ` Mayor Mary Marvin said last night "); Adely, Village revisits taxation fairness, The Journal News, January 24, 2006, p. 1 (" Tax talk continues to dominate Bronxville as the village proceeds with a review of its tax-assessment practices, which came under fire last year over allegations that some properties were undervalued while other were unfairly overtaxes. Village taxpayers began a push for revaluation after two residents release a report charging that tax assessments were inequitable and ignored changed to home values when homeowners did major renovations and expansions "); Medina, The Tax Assessment Report That Roared, New York Times Sunday Edition, Real Estate Section, March 6, 2005, p. 5.

44. Wilson, Revaluation project rocks Bronxville, The Journal News, December 17, 2006, p. 3A (" The revaluation of Bronxville's real estate has sent shock waves through this prosperous southern Westchester village, where scores of multi-million dollar homes were undervalued for years...While the revaluation has walloped homeowners...it has also shifted a chunk of the property-tax burden from the village's commercial sector to Bronxville's 1,200 owners of single and two-family homes. The

homeowners will see their share of the municipality's tax burden grow from 77 percent to 83 percent, resulting in an average property tax hike of 7.8 percent. And that's before the homeowners brace themselves for the impact of skyrocketing home values, sending the village and school tax bills for a few to almost \$90,000. Village/school taxes comprise about 63 percent of a Bronxville homeowner's property tax bill ").

45. Medina, A Showdown On Taxes In Bronxville, N.Y. Times Sunday Edition, Westchester Section, July 24, 2005, p. 1(" Bronxville's board of trustees has commissioned a study by Robert Eckert, a leading expert in property tax assessment and David C. Wilkes, an internationally known real estate lawyer based in Tarrytown ").

46. See www.villageofbronxville.com, Village Assessor tab.

47. Wilkes, A Legal Analysis of Assessment Practices and Property Tax Equity in the Village of Bronxville, September 12, 2005 (" if the Village Board should choose to direct a revaluation, it should do so following a thorough modeling of the tax impacts that would occur and detailed consideration of any means of mitigating the most severe impacts, such as through the Homestead Tax Option and transitional assessments ").

48. Eckert, Assessment Practices and Effective Tax Rate Variations in Bronxville, September 8, 2005 (" The following study examines Bronxville's assessment practices relative to its handling of building permits and examines effective tax rate variations inherent in the current assessments...While the 19.6% COD may be legally acceptable under New York State case law, our opinion is that the variations in effective tax rates inherent in the Bronxville assessment represent a significant departure from both good assessment practices...The Village should conduct further studies to examine strategies for bringing effective tax rates in line with the standard articulated in the New York State Real Property Tax Law ").

49. Id (" To encourage (annual reassessment) New York State [R.P.T.L. § 1573] provides State Aid of up to \$5 per eligible parcel to municipalities that keep assessments at 100% of market value each year. For special assessing units [New York City and Nassau County], uniformity must be maintained within each class...Section 1573 of the RPTL (requires eligible assessing units to)(1) Annually maintain assessments at 100 percent of market value, (2) Annually conduct a systematic analysis of all locally assessed properties, (3) Annually revise assessments where necessary to maintain the stated uniform percentage of

value, (4) Implement a program to physically inspect and re-appraise each property at least once every six years and (5) comply with applicable statutes and rules ").

50. ORPS Guidelines for the Annual Aid Program at <http://www.orps.state.ny.us/reassess/annualaid/overview.htm>

51. See ORPS Evaluation of the New York State Office of Real Property Services Annual Reassessment Program, www.orps.state.ny.us/reassess/exsummary.htm.

52. See ORPS Selective Assessing vs. Fair Assessing, www.orps.state.ny.us/reassess/selectivevsfair.cfm (" In 2004, approximately, 370 cities and towns, ranging in size from towns with a few hundred parcels to New York City, are conducting reassessments. Of those, approximately 280 are committed to keeping assessments at market value annually ").

53. Stern v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 483, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 482 (2d Dept. 2000).

54. See e.g., Joan Dale Young v. The Town of Bedford, 9 Misc. 3d 1115(A)(West. 2005)(" it is appropriate on the initial assessment of newly created property for an Assessor to consider, among other factors, [and " so long as the implicit policy is applied even-handedly to all similarly situated property "] " the current market value (of the newly created property and of comparable properties in the Town of Bedford) to reach a tax assessment " .

55. Allegheny Pittsburgh Coal Co. v. County Commission of Webster County, 488 U.S. 336, 344, 109 S. Ct. 633 (1989).

56. Corvetti v. Town of Lake Pleasant, 227 A.D. 2d 821, 823, 642 N.Y.S. 2d 420 (3d Dept. 1996)

57. Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors, 202 A.D. 2d 499, 609 N.Y.S. 2d 27 (2d Dept. 1994).

58. Nash v. Assessor of Town of Southampton, 168 A.D. 2d 102, 109, 571 N.Y.S. 2d 951 (2d Dept. 1991).

59. Siegel, Reassessment on Sale, New York Law Journal, August 2, 2005, p. 16 (" unless there is a planned revaluation or a comprehensive plan to review the assessments of all properties in the assessing unit, reassessment on sale violates the Equal

Protection Clauses of the federal and New York state constitutions ").

60. Schwaner v. Town of Canandaigua, 17 A.D. 2d 1068, 1069, 794 N.Y.S. 2d 233 (4th Dept. 2005).

61. Incorporated Village of Southampton v. Noa, 13 Misc. 3d 1210 (Suffolk Sup. 2006).

62. Matter of Charles Krugman v. Board of Assessors of the Village of Atlantic Beach, 141 A.D. 2d 175, 184, 533 N.Y.S. 2d 495 (2d Dept. 1988).

63. Matter of Stern v. City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 483, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 100 (2d Dept. 2000).

64. Matter of Feldman v. Assessor of Town of Bedford, 236 A.D. 2d 399, 653 N.Y.S. 2d 28 (2d Dept. 1997).

65. Incorporated Village of Southampton v. Noa, 13 Misc. 3d 1210 (Suffolk Sup. 2006).

66. Matter of Charles Krugman v. Board of Assessors of the Village of Atlantic Beach, 141 A.D. 2d 175, 184, 533 N.Y.S. 2d 495 (2d Dept. 1988).

67. Allegheny Pittsburgh Coal Co. v. County Commission of Webster County, 488 U.S. 336, 344, 109 S. Ct. 633 (1989).

68. Adams v. Welch, 272 A.D. 2d 642, 707 N.Y.S. 2d 691 (3d Dept. 2000).

69. Kardos v. Ryan, 28 A.D. 3d 1050, 814 N.Y.S. 2d 336 (3d Dept. 2006).

70. Matter of DeLeonardis v. City of Mount Vernon, 226 A.D. 2d 530, 532, 641 N.Y.S. 2d 83 (2d Dept. 1996).

71. Feigert v. Assessor of the Town of Bedford, 204 A.D. 2d 543, 544, 614 N.Y.S. 2d 200 (2d Dept. 1994).

72. Schwaner v. Town of Canandaigua, 17 A.D. 2d 1068, 1069, 794 N.Y.S. 2d 233 (4th Dept. 2005).

73. Matter of Reszin Adams v. Welch, 272 A.D. 2d 642, 707 N.Y.S. 2d 691 (3d Dept. 2000).

74. Matter of Averbach v. Board of Assessors, 176 A.D. 2d 1151, 575 N.Y.S. 2d 964 (3d Dept. 1991).

75. Gray v. Huonker, 305 A.D. 2d 1081, 758 N.Y.S. 2d 731 (4th Dept. 2003).

76. Matter of Markim v. The Town of Orangetown, 6 Misc. 3d 1042(A) (West. Sup. 2005), 9 Misc. 3d 1115(A) (West. Sup. 2005) mod'd 11 Misc. 3d 1063(A) (Rockland Sup. 2006).

77. See ORPS Assessment Equity In New York: Results From The 2004 Market Value Survey, www.orps.state.ny.us/ref/pubs/cod/2004mvs/reporttext.htm (" The primary means of measuring assessment uniformity is a statistic known as the coefficient of dispersion (COD). The COD measures the extent to which the assessment ratios from a given roll exhibit dispersion around a midpoint...Assessing units with good assessing practices have low CODs, showing little deviation of individual assessment ratios from the median ratio...Conversely, an assessing unit with little assessment uniformity would have widely varying assessment ratios among the sampled parcels, resulting in high dispersion around the median and, therefore, a high COD. Widely varying ratios result in unequal tax bills for properties of equal value ").

78. A high COD may also be explained by changing market conditions and the decision not to participate in an annual assessment program. See e.g., Wilkes, A Legal Analysis of Assessment Practices and Property Tax Equity in the Village of Bronxville, September 12, 2005 (" An assessor in a community that does not regularly revalue might with all good intention seek to moderate the amount of assessment increases in an effort to minimize overall dispersion in the assessment roll. Indeed, with a coefficient of dispersion (COD) of just under 20%... Bronxville's assessment roll is not egregiously random (as some Westchester rolls are) ") and Eckert, Assessment Practices and Effective Tax Rate Variations in Bronxville, September 8, 2005 (" While the 19.6% COD may be legally acceptable under New York State case law, our opinion is that the variations in effective tax rates inherent in the Bronxville assessment represent a significant departure from both good assessment practices... "),

79. Waccabuc Construction Corp. v. Assessor of Town of Lewisboro, 166 A.D. 2d 523, 524, 560 N.Y.S. 2d 805 (2d Dept. 1990).

80. Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors, 202 A.D. 2d 499, 500, 609 N.Y.S. 2d 27 (2d Dept. 1994).

81. Matter of Towne House Village Condominium v. Assessor of the Town of Islip, 200 A.D. 2d 749, 607 N.Y.S. 2d 87 (2d Dept. 1994).
82. Matter of Stern v. City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 483, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 100 (2d Dept. 2000).
83. Kardos v. Ryan, 28 A.D. 3d 1050, 814 N.Y.S. 2d 336 (3d Dept. 2006).
84. Kaminsky v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining, 2006 WL 1628978 (West. Sup. 2006).
85. AKW Holdings LLC v. Assessor of the Town of Clarkstown, 12 Misc. 3d 1160 (Rockland Sup. 2006).
86. Matter of Villemena v. City of Mount Vernon, 7 Misc. 3d 1020(A)(West. Sup. 2005).
87. Parisi v. Assessor of the Town of Southampton, 2007 WL 1722019 (Suffolk Sup. 2007).
88. McCready v. Assessor of the Town of Ossining, 11 Misc. 3d 1086 (West. Sup. 2006).
89. Matter of Bock v. Assessor of the Town/Village of Scarsdale, 2006 WL 328503 (West. Sup. 2006).
90. Teja v. The Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh, Index No: 14628/03, J. Rosato, Decision May 27, 2004 .
91. Carter v. The City of Mount Vernon, Index No: 19301/02, J. Rosato, Decision November 25, 2003.
92. Joan Dale Young v. The Town of Bedford, 9 Misc. 3d 1107(A) (West. Sup. 2005), aff'd 2007 WL 530575 (2d Dept. 2007).
93. Wilson v. Dziejzic, 13 Misc. 3d 242, 818 N.Y.S. 2d 750 (Broome Sup. 2006)(" While this court is not inclined to direct respondents to carry out a comprehensive revaluation of all real property in the town, it bears noting that doing so would go a long way toward alleviating the apparent frustration of all parties involved in this proceeding...and that continuing to resist that obvious solution will most likely resulting growing numbers of legal challenges, as it becomes more difficult to achieve the ' rough equality ' required of a taxing system

while so many homes continue to be assessed on the basis of archaic data and a procedure which ` ignore[s] the real market value ` of those properties ").

94. Stern v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 483, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 482 (2d Dept. 2000).

95. Stern v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 268 A.D. 2d 482, 483, 702 N.Y.S. 2d 482 (2d Dept. 2000).

96. James Montgomery v. Board of Assessment Review of the Town of Union, 2006 WL 1549386 (3d Dept. 2006).

97. Wilson v. Dziedzic, 13 Misc. 3d 242, 818 N.Y.S. 2d 750 (Broome Sup. 2006).

98. Nash v. Assessor of Town of Southampton, 168 A.D. 2d 102, 109, 571 N.Y.S. 2d 951 (2d Dept. 1991).

99. Mundinger v. Assessor of the City of Rye, 187 A.D. 2d 594, 590 N.Y.S. 2d 122 (2d Dept. 1992).

100. Matter of Fred Chasalow v. Board of Assessors, 176 A.D. 2d 800, 803, 575 N.Y.S. 2d 129 (2d Dept. 1991).

101. Matter of Acorn Ponds v. Board of Assessors, 197 A.D. 2d 620, 621, 603 N.Y.S. 2d 491 (2d Dept. 1993).

102. Matter of Akerman v. Assessor of Town of Hardenburg, 211 A.D. 2d 916, 917, 621 N.Y.S. 2d 154 (3d Dept. 1995).

103. Matter of MGD Holdings v. Town of Haverstraw, 8 Misc. 3d 1013(A) (Rockland Sup. 2005)(motion for summary judgment denied), 11 Misc. 3d 1054(A)(Rockland Sup. 2006)(motion to reargue granted and upon reargument earlier decision adhered to).

104. Matter of Markim v. Assessor of the Town of Greenburgh, 11 Misc. 3d 1063(A) (Rockland Sup. 2006).