

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],  
Claimant

Reg. No: 2007-16323  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
September 5, 2007  
Grand Traverse County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jay W. Sexton

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on September 5, 2007, in Traverse City. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Cindy Nelson (FIM). The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

Claimant requested additional time to submit new medical evidence. Claimant's new medical evidence was sent to the State Hearing Review Team on January 16, 2009. Claimant waived the timeliness requirements so his new medical evidence could be reviewed by SHRT. After SHRT's second disability determination, the Administrative Law Judge made the final decision below.

ISSUES

(1) Did claimant establish a severe mental impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P)?

(2) Did claimant establish a severe physical impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P)

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

(1) Claimant is an MA-P applicant (March 28, 2007) who was denied by SHRT (August 3, 2007) due to claimant's ability to perform a wide range of light work. SHRT relied on Med-Voc Rule 202.14 as a guide.

(2) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(4) Claimant had the following unable-to-work complaints:

- (a) Pain in his testicles;
- (b) Pain in the back;
- (c) Bipolar disorder.

(5) SHRT evaluated claimant's medical evidence as follows:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(6) Claimant performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dishwashing, laundry and grocery shopping. Claimant lives alone.

(7) Claimant has a valid driver's license and drives an automobile approximately four times a month. Claimant is not computer literate.

(8) The following medical records are persuasive:

See SHRT summary and Paragraph #5 above.

(9) On January 26, 2009, SHRT approved claimant for MA-P benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

LEGAL BASE

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative

Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Since SHRT has determined that claimant is disabled for MA-P purposes, it is not necessary for the Administrative Law Judge to rule on the issue of disability. The local office will determine whether claimant meets the financial eligibility standards.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant is disabled for MA-P purposes.

The local office shall obtain current medicals and review claimant's eligibility for ongoing MA-P on February 1, 2010.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Jay W. Sexton  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 6, 2009

Date Mailed: February 9, 2009

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

2007-16323/jws

JWS/tg

