

Tax group waits for a final ruling

Andrew Pridgen Bonanza News Editor, apridgen@tahoebonanza.com August 18, 2006

It's been 60 days since Nevada State Supreme Court justices heard the arguments for and against upholding Carson City District Court Judge William Maddox's decision to invalidate county assessor's land valuation efforts for 17 Incline Village property owners.

Sixty days and still no decision - but that may soon change.

"Thursday is when the supreme court issues their decisions," Village League to Save Incline Assets president Maryanne Ingemanson said. "If the gods are with us, maybe we'll have a decision today.

"We haven't heard anything from the supreme court as to how they might determine it, but it may be favorable (news) to the citizens of Incline Village."

As of press time Thursday, the state supreme court did not come down with a decision.

Tax revolters, however, expect to hear something anytime within the next month.

"There's no promise, of course," Ingemanson said. "We were told between the 60- and 90-day window and we have great confidence that's when (the announcement) will be."

Since the June 15 supreme court hearing, revolters have speculated the court's decision could have a domino effect to roll-back all Incline Village/Crystal property tax valuations to 2002.

Collective rebates to and land holders could reach \$30 million.

Regardless of the decision, members of the revolt group have said they'll take their fight further.

Last month, tax revolters eyed the next legislative session (to begin Feb. 5, 2007) to feature discussion on how to make the process for tax relief and equalization more equitable.

"If the (taxation) boards do something wrong, it's like 'oh well, they didn't do that correctly' there's no punishment, no accountability and that needs to be addressed by the legislature," Ingemanson said.

The tax revolt group maintains the appraisal system here should be equalized with the rest of the state - that a uniform system eventually be codified by lawmakers; this notion was contested in front of the supreme court in June.

"With regards to uniformity, I don't think it's protected by the (state) constitution Article 10 section 1," said Washoe County deputy district attorney Terry Shea, referencing a case and ensuing law meted in 1893.

Indeed, if at least one supreme court justice's opinion is rendered relevant, the state's current tax laws could be called into question in '07.

"With all due respect," Justice Michael Douglas told attorney Shea, "we have laws in this state that are plain not good."

But for now, the revolters will have to wait.

"When a (supreme court) decision comes, you'll hear about it," Ingemanson said. "I'll be doing an end-zone dance."