

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: 2008-13356  
Issue No: 2009/4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
June 11, 2008  
Roscommon County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Marlene B. Magyar

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 on June 11, 2008. Claimant and her sister personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the department properly determine claimant is not disabled by Medicaid (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) eligibility standards?

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 divorced, 52-year-old smoker with a GED; she currently resides at her sister's house.

(2) On November 9, 2007, claimant's Social Security disability application was denied; she did not pursue an appeal.

(3) In the interim, on July 20, 2007, claimant applied for state disability assistance (MA/SDA) alleging impairments identical to those she alleged at the federal level; when her state application was denied, claimant filed a hearing request dated January 28, 2008.

(4) Claimant stands approximately 5'4" tall and is medically obese at 185 pounds (BMI=31.8); she is right hand dominant.

(5) Claimant has never been involved in mental health or substance abuse treatment/counseling and she has had no recent hospitalizations.

(6) Claimant has a work history in waitressing and cashiering; she was last employed in July, 2007 (Department Exhibit #1, pg 7).

(7) Claimant's June, 2008 cervical MRI scan reveals multiple levels affected by disc bulging, foraminal narrowing, canal stenosis and facet arthropathy (Client Exhibit A, pgs 10 and 11).

(8) Claimant's treating physician has prescribed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for claimant's reported neck, shoulder, head and arm pain stemming from this condition.

(9) During an independent physical examination conducted on September 14, 2007, claimant's left (non-dominant) hand strength was mildly diminished (4/5) and she exhibited mild cervical spine range of motion limitations, but the remainder of her examination was normal (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 17-21).

(10) One month prior to claimant's June 11, 2008 hearing date, her treating nurse practitioner prescribed [REDACTED] for self-reported depression (See also Finding of Fact #5 above).

(11) Claimant stated she was diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis in 2002, but she presented absolutely no objective medical evidence to substantiate this allegation.

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).

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).

Jurisdiction must be established for a contested case review of departmental action before a decision on the merits of the case can be made. The applicable departmental policy states:

**Final SSI Disability Determination**

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
  - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**

- .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. PEM, Item 260, pp. 2-3.

This policy is also applied in SDA cases, because the MA, SDA and Social Security disability definitions are identical, except for a shorter durational period for SDA (90 days).

The relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until that determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(2)(b)(i). This regulation also provides: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the department." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(2)(b)(ii). These federal mandates are also reflected in the policy items cited above. (PEM Item 260).

The evidence of record in this case verifies claimant received a final SSA determination in November, 2007. Claimant is now alleging impairments identical to those the SSA has already reviewed. Consequently, under the above-cited federal regulations and state policy, no jurisdiction exists for this Administrative Law Judge to proceed on the merits of this case. The status quo must remain intact. The department's action must remain upheld. In closing, this Administrative Law Judge notes claimant would not have prevailed on the merits, even if a full analysis was required.

Michigan's SDA program differs from the federal MA regulations only because the durational requirement is 90 days. This means that the person's impairments must meet the SSI disability standards for 90 days in order for that person to be eligible for SDA benefits. Otherwise, the rules are identical for both programs.

Michigan administers the federal MA program. In assessing eligibility, Michigan defers to the federal guidelines. These federal guidelines state in part:

"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. [SDA duration = 90 days].

...We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

...If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

...If you do not have any impairment or combination of impairments which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, we will find that you do not have a severe impairment and are, therefore, not disabled. We will not consider your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

[In reviewing your impairment]...We need reports about your impairments from acceptable medical sources.... 20 CFR 416.913(a).

...If you have an impairment(s) which meets the duration requirement and is listed in Appendix 1 or is equal to a listed impairment(s), we will find you disabled without considering your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

...If we cannot make a decision on your current work activities or medical facts alone and you have a severe impairment, we will then review your residual functional capacity and the physical and mental demands of the work you have done in the past. If you can still do this kind of work, we will find that you are not disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

If you cannot do any work you have done in the past because you have a severe impairment(s), we will consider your residual functional capacity and your age, education, and past work experience to see if you can do other work. If you cannot, we will find you disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(f)(1).

At application, claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to the following section:

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

The federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required from claimant to establish disability. The regulations essentially require laboratory or clinical medical reports consistent with claimant's reported symptoms, or with his/her treating doctor's statements regarding disability or the lack thereof. These regulations state in part:

...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).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...The medical evidence...must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.

- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques. Psychiatric signs are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated.
- (c) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

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

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

**Sedentary work.** Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical,

physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques.... 20 CFR 416.927(a)(1). [SDA duration = 90 days].

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

Applying the sequential analysis herein, claimant would remain eligible at the first step since she has not worked anywhere since 2007 (See Finding of Fact #6 above). 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The second step of the analysis assesses the severity of all documented impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(c). This second step is a *de minimus* standard. Ruling any ambiguities in claimant's favor, the evidence of record establishes severity is met.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meets or equals one of the listed impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Claimant does not. As such, the analysis must continue.

The fourth step looks at the ability of the applicant to return to his or her past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by the applicant in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

In this case, the record supports claimant's contention she could not return to cashiering (light) or waitressing (medium) work because those jobs required extensive walking, standing, lifting, bending, etc. which might exacerbate claimant's pain and/or cause additional injury. As such, an analysis of Step 5 is required.

The fifth and final step of the analysis applies the biographical data of each applicant to the Medical-Vocational Grid Rules to determine the functional capacity of the applicant to do

other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). After a careful review of the medical evidence submitted, this Administrative Law Judge finds Med-Voc Rule 202.21 would direct a finding of not disabled. The medical documentation in claimant's file is insufficient to indicate her conditions, standing alone or combined, would interfere with her ability to engage in other work, specifically, sedentary work.

When taken as a whole, the evidence in this file fails to meet the regulatory requirements necessary to qualify for disability-based MA or SDA. Consequently, claimant's disputed application must remain denied based on lack of jurisdiction, or *in arguendo*, because she retains the residual functional capacity to perform sedentary work pursuant to Med-Voc Rule 201.21.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department properly determined claimant is not disabled.

Accordingly, the department's action is AFFIRMED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Marlene B. Magyar  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 13, 2009

Date Mailed: May 14, 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.

2008-13356/mbm

MBM/db

cc:

