



STATE OF NEVADA  
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

STEVE SISOLAK  
*Governor*

1550 College Parkway, Suite 115  
Carson City, Nevada 89706-7921  
Telephone (775) 684-2160  
Fax (775) 684-2020

Shellie Hughes  
*Secretary*

In the Matter of	)	Case No. 21-114
	)	
APN: 124-18-311-151	)	
	)	
Jack Morgan and Gail La Vonne McLaughlin	)	
PETITIONER	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Clark County Assessor,	)	
RESPONDENT	)	
	)	
Direct Appeal to State Board of Equalization	)	

NOTICE OF DECISION

***Appearances***

No one appeared on behalf of Petitioners, Jack Morgan and Gail La Vonne McLaughlin (Taxpayer).

Doug Scott and MaryAnn Weidner appeared on behalf of the Respondent, Clark County Assessor (Assessor).

***Summary***

The matter of the Taxpayer's direct appeal for a change to the taxable value of real property for the 2020-2021 supplemental roll came before the State Board of Equalization (State Board) for hearing in Las Vegas, Nevada and via Zoom on July 19, 2021.

On or about February 5, 2021, Taxpayer filed a direct appeal with the State Board of Equalization (State Board). Pursuant to NAC 361.7014, the Department recommended that this matter be dismissed as it was not heard first by the Clark County Board of Equalization (County Board).

The State Board, having considered all evidence, documents and testimony pertaining to the jurisdiction of the State Board, hereby makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The State Board is an administrative body created pursuant to NRS 361.375.

2. Taxpayer and Assessor were given adequate, proper and legal notice of the time and place of the hearing before the State Board, and the matter was properly noticed pursuant to the Open Meeting Law at NRS 241.020.

3. Taxpayer did not file an appeal of the valuation of the subject property with the County Board.

4. Direct appeals to the State Board may be made when real or personal property is placed on the unsecured tax roll and was assessed after December 15 but before or on the following April 30.

5. Assessor testified that Taxpayer was challenging the supplemental roll change that was assessed prior to December 15, but was also already reduced by Assessor.

6. Taxpayer's petition had to be filed with the County Board no later than January 15 under NRS 361.356 and NRS 361.357.

7. Assessor testified that a change was made to the 2021-2022 taxable value for the subject property.

8. Any finding of fact above construed to constitute a conclusion of law is adopted as such to the same extent as if originally so denominated.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The State Board has authority to determine whether it has jurisdiction to hear a matter.

2. Taxpayer has the burden of proof pursuant to NAC 361.745.

3. Taxpayer must show there are substantial circumstances beyond the control of the Taxpayer as to why it did not appeal to the County Board.

4. No evidence was presented to the State Board to justify it take jurisdiction to hear this matter.

5. Any conclusion of law above construed to constitute a finding of fact is adopted as such to the same extent as if originally so denominated.

#### DECISION

Based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and a preponderance of the evidence, the State Board unanimously decided not to take jurisdiction over the appeal. The Petition is denied.

BY THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION THIS 29<sup>th</sup> DAY OF September, 2021.

  
Shellie Hughes, Secretary