

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: 2008-12344  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
October 14, 2008  
Gladwin 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, an in-person hearing was held in Gladwin on October 14, 2008. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. The department was represented by Teri Ehle (ES).

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 a MA-P applicant (November 29, 2007) who was denied by SHRT (March 31, 2008) due to claimant's failure to establish an impairment which meets the severity and duration requirements. Claimant requests retro MA for August, September and October 2007.

(2) Claimant vocational factors are: age—58; education—10<sup>th</sup> grade; post high school education—none; work experience—house painter, [REDACTED] production worker and truck driver for [REDACTED].

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since 1993 when he was a house painter.

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

- (a) Right side body pain;
- (b) Arthritis;
- (c) Status post aortic aneurysm repair (U of M/2007);
- (d) Impaired hearing (right side).

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

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (March 31, 2008)**

In 10/2007, claimant underwent surgery to repair an abdominal aortic aneurysm that ruptured. A history of pancreatitis due to heavy alcohol abuse, was noted in the records (pages 5-10).

ANALYSIS: Claimant's condition is expected to improve post operatively.

(6) Claimant lives alone and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking (sometimes), dishwashing, light cleaning (needs help). Claimant uses a cane on a daily basis. He does not use a walker, a wheelchair, or a shower stool. He does not wear braces on his neck, back, arms or legs. Claimant was admitted at [REDACTED], for repair of an aortic aneurysm.

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

(8) The following medical records are persuasive:

(a) A [REDACTED] medical report was reviewed.

The physician provided the following background:

Claimant returns to the clinic status post emergent repair of a ruptured 9-centimeter juxtarenal abdominal aortic aneurysm. Claimant was transferred from [REDACTED], [REDACTED], with a 9-centimeter juxtarenal abdominal aortic aneurysm and abdominal pain and nausea. Claimant has a history of heavy alcohol use and was found to have pancreatitis on admission. In addition, he was noted to have findings consistent with delirium tremens after 24 hours of being admitted. Patient was subsequently treated for his pancreatitis with NPO and hyperalimentation, when he developed transient hypotension on hospital day three. Claimant was taken emergently to the operating room, where he freely ruptured his aneurysm while in the operating room prior to induction. He subsequently underwent an emergent repair of his aneurysm. His post operative course was complicated by planned delayed abdominal closure, but made a strong recovery. He was discharged to home with an abdominal wound VAC for his open abdominal wound. He presents today for post operative follow-up.

The physical examination showed that claimant's midline abdominal incision was healing well and had good granulation tissue...

The physician provided the following impression:

My impression is that claimant is doing well status post ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm. We will continue the VAC for at least one more month in order to facilitate his wound healing. I am encouraged that claimant has refrained from smoking and drinking since his discharge from the hospital. Claimant still has occasional pain associated with the laparotomy and I prescribed for him [medications].

\*\*\*

(9) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (non-exertional) mental condition expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. Claimant does not allege a mental impairment as the basis for his disability. There are no psychiatric/psychological reports in the record. Also claimant did not provide a DHS-49D or a DHS-49E to show his mental residual functional capacity.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The physicians from the [REDACTED] indicate that claimant's repair of his aortic aneurysm was a successful procedure. No work limitations have been imposed.

(11) Claimant recently applied for federal disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. His application is currently pending.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

##### **CLAIMANT'S POSITION**

Claimant thinks he is entitled to MA-P based on the impairments listed in paragraph #4, above.

##### **DEPARTMENT'S POSITION**

The department thinks that claimant has normal residual functional capacity.

The department thinks that claimant's condition is improving or expected to improve within 12 months of the date of his surgery (September 2007).

**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).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.... 20 CFR 416.905

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include --

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;
- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and

(6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
3. Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

**Claimant has the burden of proof** to show by a preponderance of the medical evidence in the record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P purposes. PEM 260. "Disability" as defined by MA-P standards is a legal term which is individually determined by a consideration of all factors in each particular case.

### **STEP 1**

The issue at Step 1 is whether claimant is performing substantial gainful activity (SGA). If claimant is working and is earning substantial income, he is not eligible for MA-P.

SGA is defined as the performance of significant duties over a reasonable period of time for pay. Claimants who are working, or otherwise performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA), are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The medical/vocational evidence of record shows that claimant is not currently performing SGA.



Therefore, claimant meets the Step 1 disability test.

**STEP 2**

The issue at Step 2 is whether claimant has impairments which meet the SSI definition of severity/duration.

Unless an impairment is expected to result in death, it must have lasted or be expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 20 CFR 416.909.

Also to qualify for MA-P, claimant must satisfy both the gainful work and the duration criteria. 20 CFR 416.920(a).

Since the severity/duration requirement is a *de minimus* requirement, claimant meets the Step 2 disability test.

**STEP 3**

The issue at Step 3 is whether claimant meets the Listing of Impairments in the SSI regulations. SHRT decided that claimant does not meet any of the applicable SSI Listings.

Therefore, claimant does not meet the Step 3 disability test.

**STEP 4**

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do his previous work. Claimant previously worked as a house painter for a painting contractor. Claimant's work as a house painter was medium work.

There is no clear medical evidence in the record which suggests that claimant has any functional limitations as a result of his status post aortic aneurysm repair. However, claimant testified that he continues to have right side body pain and arthritis and this would prevent him from climbing ladders which is a required activity for painters.

Because claimant is unable to climb ladders, he is not able to perform his previous work as a painter.

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 4 disability test.

**STEP 5**

The issue at Step 5 is whether claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to do other work.

Claimant has the burden of proof to show by the medical/psychological evidence in the record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P purposes.

First, claimant does not allege a mental impairment as the basis for his disability. Also, there is no psychological/psychiatric evidence in the record to establish a severe mental impairment.

Second, claimant alleges disability based on right side body pain, arthritis, impaired hearing (right) and status post aortic aneurysm repair. There is no medical evidence to establish that claimant is unable to do any work.

During the hearing, claimant testified that a major impediment to his return to work was his right side body pain. Unfortunately, evidence of pain, alone, is insufficient to establish disability for MA-P purposes.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant's testimony about his pain is profound and credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his right side body pain, in combination with his arthritis. Claimant currently performs many activities of daily living and has an active social life with his neighbors who help him with his chores. Considering the entire medical record, in combination with claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform simple

unskilled sedentary work (SGA). In this capacity, he is able to work as a ticket taker for a theater, as a parking lot attendant and as a greeter at [REDACTED].

Based on this analysis, the department correctly denied claimant's MA-P application based on Step 5 of the sequential analysis, as presented above.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant does not meet the MA-P disability requirements under PEM 260.

Accordingly, the department's denial of claimant's MA-P application is, hereby, AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

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

Date Signed: January 25, 2010

Date Mailed: January 25, 2010

**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 mailing 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.

JWS/vmc

2008-12344/JWS

cc:

