2009 Legislature

1	A bill to be entitled
2	An act relating to ad valorem assessments; amending s.
3	194.301, F.S.; revising the bases for providing a
4	presumption of correctness to an assessment of property
5	value; providing that the taxpayer is entitled to an
6	evaluation of the appraisal methodology; providing that
7	the act preempts prior case law; revising the criteria for
8	overcoming the presumption of correctness; providing for
9	challenges to the classification or exemption status of
10	property; providing for application; providing legislative
11	intent relating to taxpayer burden of proof; rejecting
12	certain case law precedent; providing construction;
13	providing for retroactive application; providing an
14	effective date.
15	
16	Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:
17	
18	Section 1. Section 194.301, Florida Statutes, is amended
19	to read:
20	(Substantial rewording of section. See
21	s. 194.301, F.S., for present text.)
22	194.301 Challenge to ad valorem tax assessment
23	(1) In any administrative or judicial action in which a
24	taxpayer challenges an ad valorem tax assessment of value, the
25	property appraiser's assessment is presumed correct if the
26	appraiser proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the
27	assessment was arrived at by complying with s. 193.011, any
28	other applicable statutory requirements relating to classified

## Page 1 of 4

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

2009 Legislature

29	use values or assessment caps, and professionally accepted
30	appraisal practices, including mass appraisal standards, if
31	appropriate. However, a taxpayer who challenges an assessment is
32	entitled to a determination by the value adjustment board or
33	court of the appropriateness of the appraisal methodology used
34	in making the assessment. The value of property must be
35	determined by an appraisal methodology that complies with the
36	criteria of s. 193.011 and professionally accepted appraisal
37	practices. The provisions of this subsection preempt any prior
38	case law that is inconsistent with this subsection.
39	(2) In an administrative or judicial action in which an ad
40	valorem tax assessment is challenged, the burden of proof is on
41	the party initiating the challenge.
42	(a) If the challenge is to the assessed value of the
43	property, the party initiating the challenge has the burden of
44	proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the assessed
	proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the assessed value:
44	
44 45	value:
44 45 46	value: <u>1. Does not represent the just value of the property after</u>
44 45 46 47	value: <u>1. Does not represent the just value of the property after</u> taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in
44 45 46 47 48	value: <u>1. Does not represent the just value of the property after</u> taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in the value of the property;
44 45 46 47 48 49	<pre>value: <u>1. Does not represent the just value of the property after</u> taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in the value of the property; <u>2. Does not represent the classified use value or</u></pre>
44 45 46 47 48 49 50	value:   1. Does not represent the just value of the property after   taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in   the value of the property;   2. Does not represent the classified use value or   fractional value of the property if the property is required to
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51	<u>value:</u> <u>1. Does not represent the just value of the property after</u> <u>taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in</u> <u>the value of the property;</u> <u>2. Does not represent the classified use value or</u> <u>fractional value of the property if the property is required to</u> <u>be assessed based on its character or use; or</u>
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	value:1. Does not represent the just value of the property aftertaking into account any applicable limits on annual increases inthe value of the property;2. Does not represent the classified use value orfractional value of the property if the property is required tobe assessed based on its character or use; or3. Is arbitrarily based on appraisal practices that are
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53	<pre>value: 1. Does not represent the just value of the property after taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in the value of the property; 2. Does not represent the classified use value or fractional value of the property if the property is required to be assessed based on its character or use; or 3. Is arbitrarily based on appraisal practices that are different from the appraisal practices generally applied by the</pre>
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	<pre>value: 1. Does not represent the just value of the property after taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in the value of the property; 2. Does not represent the classified use value or fractional value of the property if the property is required to be assessed based on its character or use; or 3. Is arbitrarily based on appraisal practices that are different from the appraisal practices generally applied by the property appraiser to comparable property within the same</pre>
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55	<pre>value: 1. Does not represent the just value of the property after taking into account any applicable limits on annual increases in the value of the property; 2. Does not represent the classified use value or fractional value of the property if the property is required to be assessed based on its character or use; or 3. Is arbitrarily based on appraisal practices that are different from the appraisal practices generally applied by the property appraiser to comparable property within the same county.</pre>

Page 2 of 4

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words <u>underlined</u> are additions.

2009 Legislature

1	
59	court shall establish the assessment if there is competent,
60	substantial evidence of value in the record which cumulatively
61	meets the criteria of s. 193.011 and professionally accepted
62	appraisal practices. If the record lacks such evidence, the
63	matter must be remanded to the property appraiser with
64	appropriate directions from the value adjustment board or the
65	court, and the property appraiser must comply with those
66	directions.
67	(c) If the revised assessment following remand is
68 69	challenged, the procedures described in this section apply. (d) If the challenge is to the classification or exemption
70	status of the property, there is no presumption of correctness
71	and the party initiating the challenge has the burden of proving
72	by a preponderance of the evidence that the classification or
12	
73	exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect.
73	exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect.
73 74	exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. <u>(1)</u> It is the express intent of the
73 74 75	exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. <u>(1) It is the express intent of the</u> Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of
73 74 75 76	exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. <u>(1) It is the express intent of the</u> Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not
73 74 75 76 77	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment.</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78 79	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard were expressly rejected by the Legislature on the adoption of</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard were expressly rejected by the Legislature on the adoption of chapter 97-85, Laws of Florida. It is the further intent of the</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard were expressly rejected by the Legislature on the adoption of chapter 97-85, Laws of Florida. It is the further intent of the Legislature that any cases published since 1997 citing the</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard were expressly rejected by the Legislature on the adoption of chapter 97-85, Laws of Florida. It is the further intent of the Legislature that any cases published since 1997 citing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard are expressly rejected to</pre>
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83	<pre>exempt status assigned to the property is incorrect. Section 2. (1) It is the express intent of the Legislature that a taxpayer shall never have the burden of proving that the property appraiser's assessment is not supported by any reasonable hypothesis of a legal assessment. All cases establishing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard were expressly rejected by the Legislature on the adoption of chapter 97-85, Laws of Florida. It is the further intent of the Legislature that any cases published since 1997 citing the every-reasonable-hypothesis standard are expressly rejected to the extent that they are interpretative of legislative intent.</pre>

# Page 3 of 4

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

#### 2009 Legislature

86 Section 3. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law 87 and shall first apply to assessments in 2009.

Page 4 of 4

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words <u>underlined</u> are additions.