



STATE OF NEVADA  
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Joe Lombardo  
*Governor*

3850 Arrowhead Drive  
Carson City, Nevada 89706  
Telephone (775) 684-2160

Shellie Hughes  
*Secretary*

In the Matter of	)	
	)	Case No. 25-125
AMARPREET S. CHADHA & JASMEET K.	)	
CHADHA,	)	
	)	
PETITIONER	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
CLARK COUNTY ASSESSOR,	)	
	)	
RESPONDENT	)	

---

**NOTICE OF DECISION**

***Appearances***

Amarpreet Chadha and Jasmeet Chadha appearing as the Petitioner. ("Taxpayer").

Rachel Papazain, Jayme Jacobs, and Mary Ann Weidner appeared on behalf of the Clark County Assessor's Office ("Assessor").

***Summary***

This appeal of the Taxpayer's Petition for Review of residential property valuations for the 2025-2026 Tax Roll came before the State Board of Equalization ("State Board") for hearing on September 30, 2025, after an appeal in front of the Clark County Board of Equalization ("County Board").

The State Board, having considered all evidence, documents and testimony pertaining to the valuation of the property in accordance with NRS 361.227, 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) The State Board is mandated to hear all appeals of property tax assessments pursuant to NRS 361.360 and NRS 361.400.

- 3) The Taxpayer and the 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.
- 4) The subject property is residential property located in Clark County, Nevada.
- 5) The Board finds that there is an inequity in taxing the subject property.
- 6) The Board noted that there was a tax disparity between the subject property and other surrounding properties which were sold at similar values and are of similar ages. It raised the question of whether to reduce the value of the subject property or raise the value of the others.
- 7) 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 Taxpayer timely filed a notice of appeal.
- 2) Taxpayer and Assessor are subject to the jurisdiction of the State Board.
- 3) The State Board has the authority to determine the taxable values in the State.
- 4) The State Board moved that the taxable value of \$5,061,500 be reduced to an obsolescence adjustment of \$871,100 to reduce the taxable value to \$4,190,400.
- 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 finds that the value of the subject property shall have an obsolescence adjustment to \$4,190,400.

BY THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION this 25 day of November, 2025.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Shellie Hughes, Secretary