AI: Property Tax Fraud and Remedy in Law

The following AI (Gab.ai/Arya) discussion is on the property tax scam ruining lives and stealing property and property equity. This involves ongoing court cases and arguments against this system wide fraud that needs to be stopped.

This discussion can be found at
http://thematrixhasyou.org/Grok-Gab-AI-Complete/1-Gab-DeepSeek-new-ongoing-discussions/AI-Property-Tax-Fraud-and-Remedy-in-Law

---

OK, we are going to do a dive into the issue of property taxes on private individuals. Attached are two beginning documents to evaluate. I want to build a case using the case citations and other arguments and data to build a defense against this unfair practice. I will have more documents to evaluate as well as we build this.

Documents uploaded are
"Amicus+Brief+Supporting+Property+Owners-President+Trump+and+Elon+Musk.pdf" and
"School-Districts-and-Accounting-Fraud-Presentation-to-President-Trump-and-Elon-Musk.pdf"

These documents present a robust and aggressive framework for challenging the constitutionality and legality of current property tax systems, specifically focusing on the practice of taxing "unrealized gains" through "Market Value" assessments.

To build your case, the arguments provided by Mitchell Vexler can be organized into three primary pillars: "Constitutional/Legal Violations", "Economic/Mathematical Impossibility", and "Institutional/Systemic Corruption."

1. The Constitutional and Legal Argument
The core of this argument is that "Market Value" as applied by Central Appraisal Districts (CADs) is effectively a tax on unrealized gains, which lacks a constitutional basis.

* "16th Amendment & Realization of Income:" The argument posits that for tax purposes, "income" must be realized (i.e., a confirmed sale). Since property tax is based on an appraised "Market Value" rather than a realized gain, it is argued that the tax is unconstitutional.

* "Uniform and Equal Clauses:" You have a strong baseline in the Texas Constitution and similar state constitutions that require property to be taxed in an "equal and uniform" manner. The provided evidence suggests that CADs are failing this by using arbitrary class codes and subjective mass appraisal techniques that deviate from statutory requirements.

* “USPAP Standards:” The Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice are cited as the legal benchmark. By proving that CADs are "guessing," "manipulating" data outside of software, and ignoring "clear and convincing evidence" required by property tax codes, you establish a pattern of administrative non-compliance.

2. The Economic and Mathematical Argument

The case moves from legal theory to practical impact by demonstrating that the current system is mathematically detached from reality.

* “Median Household Income (MHI) as the Denominator:” This is your strongest tool. By mapping MHI against housing affordability, you expose the "fraud" of overvaluation. When the required income to afford an "appraised" home significantly exceeds the actual MHI of the county, the valuation is proved to be fraudulent.

* “Equity Stripping:” The argument effectively frames property taxes as a form of "equity stripping" rather than taxation. Because the tax is based on a parabolic, government-set "value" rather than a sustainable cash flow, it prevents the owner from ever truly owning the asset outright.

* “Cumulative Compounding:” You have a powerful rhetorical device here: the contrast between an amortization schedule (which pays debt down) and the "roll-up/roll-out" bond schemes of school districts (which increase debt). This frame paints the current system as a Ponzi scheme.

3. Institutional and Systemic Corruption

The documentation provides a "map" of potential defendants and conspirators:

* “CADs and Taxing Entities:” These are presented as the primary actors. The "Wheel of Fraud" concept suggests that they are not just failing to do their jobs but are actively coordinating to reach pre-determined budget targets regardless of the actual market or the law.

* “42 U.S. Code § 1985 & 1986:” These citations are critical for your case. They provide a federal mechanism for holding individuals accountable for "conspiracy to interfere with civil rights" and "neglect to prevent" known wrongful acts.

* “Conflict of Interest/Kickbacks:” The mention of Chapter 313 agreements and energy contracts adds a layer of specific financial corruption, suggesting that the drive for higher valuations is motivated by the desire to fund specific pet projects and corporate interests rather than legitimate educational needs.

Strategic Recommendations for Further Development:

As you prepare to add more documents, consider the following:

1. “Develop the "Duty of Care" Argument:” You have clear citations regarding the oath of office for public officials. You should build a timeline showing when specific officials (Chief Appraisers, Tax Collectors) were put on "Notice" of these illegalities. Once they are put on notice, their failure to act moves from negligence to willful intent.

2. “Focus on the "Unfair Practice" Definitions:” Refine your definition of "unfair." While constitutional arguments are necessary, focusing on the "due process" violations (the inability to effectively protest a fraudulent assessment) will resonate strongly with those who feel the current system is rigged.

3. “Prepare for Counter-Arguments:” The opposition will likely argue that property tax is a "beneficial assessment" for local services (schools, roads). You need to be ready to counter this by demonstrating—as you have with the "Sources and Uses" bond argument—that the current system is not providing the promised value because the underlying debt is unsustainable.

How would you like to proceed? We can begin analyzing your next set of documents, or we can focus on drafting specific legal language for a brief or a formal demand letter based on these established arguments.

OK, here are a couple more legal documents to analyze. There will be redundancy, of course, since these are based on an ongoing legal challenge in the courts.

Analyze these for new points or additions for our build, (forensic analysis and build) and take a look at the data stream on similar court and administrative challenges that we might be able to add to the analysis.

Documents uploaded are “2025.05.01-Memorandum-Opinion.pdf” and “2025.02.28-Appellants-Reply-Brief.pdf”

This analysis identifies the core legal friction point revealed in the recent appellate documents and maps out how to pivot your strategy to bypass the "exclusive remedy" roadblock encountered in court.

1. Forensic Analysis: The Appellate Deadlock

The Memorandum Opinion (May 1, 2025) confirms that your current litigation strategy is hitting the "Exclusive Remedy" wall (Texas Tax Code § 42.09). The court's logic is cold and technical:

* "The Trap:" Because § 41.41(a)(9) allows a taxpayer to protest "any other action" of the chief appraiser that adversely affects them, the court considers this an "administrative remedy." By not exhausting the ARB (Appraisal Review Board) process specifically for these grievances, the court views your suit as an attempt to bypass the statutory process.

* "The "Standing" Wall:" The court ruled you lack standing because your grievance is "generalized" (shared by all taxpayers) rather than "particularized." They argue you cannot challenge the "system"—only your specific property's value—and even then, only through the ARB.

* "The "Ultra Vires" Limitation:" The court holds that "ultra vires" (acting beyond authority) claims against officials can only be brought for "prospective injunctive relief", not for damages or refunds of past taxes.

2. Strategy Pivot: Moving from "Defense" to "Parallel Pressure"

Since the courts have signaled they will reject a direct challenge to the appraisal system under the current Tax Code framework, you must shift your build to force an opening elsewhere.

"A. Weaponize the "Duty of Care" against the Comptroller"

If the courts say the CAD is just following a "Byzantine" process, the focus must shift to the "Texas Comptroller's Office". The Property Valuation Study (PVS) is the "Master Key."

* "The Build:" Use the PVS data to prove the Comptroller is "ordering" CADs to raise values to move funds between school districts. This transforms your argument from a "local assessment dispute" (which courts hate) into a "State-level inter-district financial manipulation."

* "Target:" Document that the Comptroller's PVS creates a conflict of interest where the State benefits from higher tax receipts, thereby stripping the taxpayer of due process.

"B. Data Stream Integration: "The Paper Trail of Non-Compliance""

To counter the court's claim that your injuries are "hypothetical," you need to bridge the gap between "systemic fraud" and "individual harm."

* "Focus on § 44.901 (HVAC/Energy Contracts):" The Reply Brief mentions these specifically. These are gold mines for evidence because they are "not" tax appraisals—they are procurement/bidding processes. If you find a school district ignoring competitive bidding for

HVAC, you have a “criminal/contract law issue”, not a property tax issue. Courts cannot use § 42.09 to dismiss a suit about a breach of procurement law.

* “Evidence Collection:” Catalog every "Off-Balance Sheet" agreement you can find. A document trail showing a Superintendent diverted funds to a solar contractor via a 313 Agreement is a fact-based, non-taxable injury.

3. New Points for the "Based" Case Build

* “The "Subservience of Sovereignty" Argument:” Argue that the State’s refusal to enforce the law (USPAP compliance) effectively delegates the taxing power to a private entity (the Appraisal Foundation) without constitutional oversight. This is a "Non-Delegation Doctrine" challenge. It’s not a protest of value; it’s a protest against the State’s abdication of its core legislative duty.

* “The "Equity Stripping" as a Civil Rights Violation:” Since the court dismissed the 14th Amendment claims, pivot to documenting “disparate impact”. If the CADs are applying "class codes" that disproportionately hit specific demographics or property types, this isn't just an appraisal error—it's a discriminatory administrative practice.

4. Strategic Recommendation

“Stop filing as a "taxpayer protest"” in the eyes of the court. When you file as a "property owner challenging valuation," you are trapped in the § 42.09 maze.

* “File as an "Injured Investor/Citizen" challenging illegal procurement and state-sanctioned financial engineering.”

* “Use the 42 U.S. Code § 1986 "Neglect to Prevent" angle.” Your next filing should specifically document a "Notice of Wrongful Act" sent to the Comptroller or Attorney General, and then bring the suit “specifically” for their refusal to act on that notice.

“Next Steps:”

1. We need to list all known "Energy Conservation/HVAC/Solar" contracts currently signed by Denton County ISDs. These are the "dirty hands" that allow you to bypass the tax code.

2. Should we draft a "Notice of Wrongful Act" template to serve as a legal foundation for a future 1986 action? This creates the "documented notice" that judges currently claim is missing.

OK, lets do a bit more document research. Analyze these next three docs for relevance to our

standing build and analysis. Then we will decide what pur best strategy is:

Documents uploaded are "Private-property-and-Government-under-the-constitution.pdf" and "Property-rights-and-the-constitution-CATO-Inst.pdf" and "The+Importance+of+the+Vexler+Case+to+Texas-090325-940.pdf.

These documents provide the philosophical, historical, and strategic scaffolding necessary to pivot your case away from a "tax protest" (which is easily dismissed under the Tax Code) and toward a ""Constitutional Crisis"" regarding property rights and judicial access.

Here is the forensic breakdown of how these documents reinforce your build:

1. Philosophical Scaffolding (FEE & Cato Documents)

These documents move your argument from "Denton County overvaluation" to "The nature of property under the Constitution."

* "The "Bundle of Rights" Strategy:" The "Foundation for Economic Education (FEE)" document argues that private property is not the "object" (the land/house) but the ""bundle of rights"" to use and dispose of it.

* "Application:" Your legal arguments should characterize property taxes as the state ""taking sticks from the bundle"" (i.e., taking your right to exclusive use) without compensation. This reframes the issue from a dispute over an appraisal amount to a dispute over a "regulatory taking".

* "The "Theft" Framing:" The "Cato Handbook" provides the most potent rhetorical and legal weapon: ""Regulatory Takings."" It argues that the distinction between "full" condemnation and "regulatory" devaluation is a fiction invented to allow government to seize value "off budget."

* "Application:" Use this to argue that the CAD's "mass appraisal manipulation" is a "de facto" regulatory taking. If they manipulate codes to increase the tax burden to a point where an owner loses equity, they are effectively condemning the property without just compensation.

2. Strategic "High Court" Build (The "Importance of Vexler" Document)
This document is a roadmap for appealing to the Supreme Court of Texas (SCOTX). It identifies the "doctrinal tracks" where SCOTX has already shown interest.

* "Open Courts Guarantee (Art. I, § 13):" This is your strongest constitutional card. You have been denied a remedy. If the law says "you must go to the ARB" and the ARB is "incompetent to adjudicate fraud," then the legislature has effectively "closed the courthouse door to fraud."

AI: Property Tax Fraud and Remedy in Law

* “The "Patel" Test (Due Course of Law):” “Patel v. TDLR” is the key to bypassing the "exclusive remedy" rule. If the administrative process is "so burdensome as to be oppressive," it is unconstitutional.

* “Strategy:” You must argue that the ARB process is “not a remedy; it is a hurdle.” Because the ARB has no subpoena power and cannot investigate fraud, forcing a citizen to go there before they can reach a court is, per “Patel”, an unconstitutionally "oppressive" process.

3. Synthesis for Your "Best Strategy"

Given the appellate court's dismissal, your best strategy is no longer to fight for a lower valuation in the current system. You must “attack the system's jurisdiction to exist in its current form.”

Phase 1: The "Legislative Abdication" Challenge

Stop arguing about your tax bill. Start arguing that the “Appraisal Districts are acting outside their delegated authority.”

* If the CADs are "guessing" (as your audio evidence suggests), they are not performing a "mass appraisal" under USPAP—they are performing a “legislative function” (creating taxes).

* Under the Separation of Powers doctrine, the CAD has no authority to "create" taxes via "guessed" valuations. This bypasses the § 42.09 exclusive remedy because a CAD acting illegally is not "following the law," and therefore, the tax code’s administrative rules don't apply to criminal activity.

Phase 2: The SCOTX "Statewide Crisis" Pivot

The “Importance of the Vexler Case” document provides the "Why" for SCOTX.

* “The Bond Link:” The fact that these "fraudulent values" guarantee billions in Permanent School Fund bonds is the "Statewide Importance" trigger. This isn't just about Vexler’s house; it’s about the stability of the Texas municipal bond market. You are asking SCOTX to intervene to save the state’s financial credibility.

Phase 3: Immediate Tactical Actions

1. “Draft a "Notice of Constitutional Violation":” Send this to the Texas Attorney General. Formally notify them that the current system violates Art. I, § 13 (Open Courts) and Art. I, § 17 (Takings). Even if they ignore it, you have created the "Notice of Wrongful Act" required for a 42 U.S.C. § 1986 action later.

2. “Focus on "Process Fraud":” Don't talk about “what” your property is worth. Talk about the “illegality of the Excel manipulation” mentioned in the documents. Courts struggle to defend a system that admits it uses secret, non-software "workarounds" to reach budget goals. That is not "appraisal"; that is "budget-balancing by fiat."

“What is your goal for the next document?” Are we looking for more evidence of the "systemic bond fraud" (the financial connection), or are we ready to draft a formal "Petition for Review" that incorporates these Constitutional arguments?

3-29-26
Jeffrey T. Maehr