

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: 2008-12719  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
July 9, 2008  
Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Linda Steadley Schwarb

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 hearing was held on July 9, 2009. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

(1) On June 27, 2007, an application was filed on claimant's behalf for MA-P and SDA benefits. Claimant did not request retroactive medical coverage.

(2) On August 13, 2007, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.

(3) On November 6, 2007, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.

(4) Claimant, age 56, has a high school education and some college.

(5) Claimant last worked in 2003 building and repairing wooden pallets. Claimant has had no other relevant work experience. All of claimant's relevant work experiences consist exclusively of unskilled work activity.

(6) Claimant has a history of hypertension, insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus, and alcohol abuse.

(7) Claimant was hospitalized September 3<sup>rd</sup> through September 5<sup>th</sup> of 2007. His random glucose level upon admission was 1,059. His discharge diagnosis was insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus Type 2, poorly controlled; fatty liver, possibly secondary to alcohol abuse; and essential hypertension.

(8) Claimant suffers from hypertension, insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus, chronic bilateral shoulder pain, chronic lumbar pain, bilateral leg pain--rule out neuropathy, and anxiety.

(9) Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who has the physical and mental capacity to engage in simple, unskilled, light work activities on a regular and continuing basis.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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).

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“Disability” is:

...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

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, claimant is not working. Therefore, claimant is not disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities.

Basic work activities means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that claimant has significant physical and mental limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as walking and standing for long periods of time and lifting heavy objects. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant’s work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

In the third step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant’s impairment (or combination of impairments) is listed in

Appendix 1 to Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant's medical record will not support a finding that claimant's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 to Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents her from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical and psychological findings, that claimant is not capable of the walking, standing, and heavy lifting required by his past employment. Claimant has presented the required medical documentation to support a finding that he is not, at this point, capable of performing such work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once claimant reaches Step 5 in the sequential review process, claimant has already established a *prima facie* case of disability.

*Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1984). At that

point, the burden of proof is on the state to prove by substantial evidence that the claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity.

In this case, claimant has a history of hypertension, insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus, and alcohol abuse. He was hospitalized in September of 2007. His random glucose level upon admission was 1,059. Claimant's discharge diagnosis was insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus Type 2, poorly controlled; fatty liver, possibly secondary to alcohol abuse; and essential hypertension. Claimant was seen by a consulting internist for the department on July 9, 2007. The consultant diagnosed claimant with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus, right shoulder pain, chronic lumbar pain, and bilateral pain of the legs--rule out neuropathy. The consultant found claimant's condition to be deteriorating and opined that he was capable of sitting less than 6 hours in an 8-hour work day. The same consultant re-evaluated claimant for the department on August 28, 2008. At that time the consultant diagnosed claimant with hypertension; diabetes mellitus, insulin-dependent; history of fracture of the right ring finger with pain; history of pain affecting the left foot; history of fracture of the left foot mid area; chronic bilateral shoulder pain; and anxiety state. On November 19, 2008, the consultant again found claimant's clinical condition to be deteriorating. A careful review of the entire hearing record will not support a finding that claimant is capable of medium work activities. See 20 CFR 416.967(c). The record does suggest that claimant would be capable of simple, unskilled, light work activities.

Considering that claimant, at age 56, has a high school education, has an unskilled work history, and has a sustained work capacity for light work, the undersigned finds that claimant's impairments do prevent him from engaging in other work. As a guide, see 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Table 2, Rule 202.04. Certainly, if claimant were limited to sedentary work activities, he would also be found disabled. See Med-Voc Rule 201.04. Accordingly, the undersigned must find that claimant is "disabled" for purposes of the MA program.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

A person is considered disabled for purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based upon disability or blindness or the receipt of MA benefits based upon disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in PEM Item 261. Inasmuch as claimant has been found “disabled” for purposes of the MA program, he must also be found “disabled” for purposes of SDA benefits.

The Medical Social Work Consultant (MSWC), in conjunction with the Medical Review Team (MRT), is to consider the appropriateness of directing claimant to participate in appropriate mental health and/or substance abuse treatment as a condition of receipt of benefits. Unless the MSWC determines that claimant has good cause for failure to participate in mandatory treatment, claimant will lose eligibility for SDA. PEM 260, p. 5, and PEM 261, pp. 3-4.

Further, a referral is to be made to Adult Protective Services for an evaluation of possible financial management problems. Specifically, before SDA benefits may be paid to claimant, Adult Protective Services is to assess the appropriateness of a payee or conservatorship for claimant because of mental health and/or substance abuse problems which may prevent adequate management or discharge of financial or other personal affairs. See Adult Services Manual, Item 383.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant meets the definition of medically disabled under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs as of June of 2007.

Accordingly, the department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the June 27, 2007 application, if it has not already done so, to determine if all other non-medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform claimant and his authorized representative of its determination in writing. Assuming that claimant is otherwise eligible for program benefits, the department shall review claimant's continued eligibility for program benefits in March of 2010.

The Medical Social Work Consultant, in conjunction with the Medical Review Team, is to consider the appropriateness of ordering claimant to participate in mandatory mental health and/or substance abuse treatment as a condition of receipt of benefits. Further, a referral is to be made to Adult Protective Services consistent with this order.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Steadley Schwarb  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 6/16/09\_\_\_\_\_

Date Mailed: 6/22/09\_\_\_\_\_

**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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.



LSS/cv

cc:

