

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.: 2008-22010

Issue No.: 2009, 4031

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Load No.: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

September 22, 2008

Kent 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 September 22, 2008. The claimant appeared and testified. 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 February 20, 2008, claimant filed an application for MA-P and SDA benefits. Claimant requested MA-P retroactive to November 2007.
- 2) On April 21, 2008, the department denied claimant's application for benefits bases upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On June 2, 2008, claimant filed a hearing request to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 30, has an 11th grade education.
- 5) Claimant last worked in 2006 packaging cereal boxes. Claimant has also performed relevant work in construction and factory work. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of unskilled worked activities.
- 6) Claimant has a history of a gunshot wound to the right thigh in 2006.
- 7) On November 17, 2007, claimant sustained a gunshot wound to the left upper extremity. Claimant underwent open reduction and internal fixation.
- 8) Claimant continues to experience pain with reduced range of motion in the left upper extremity as well as reduced grip strength in the left (non dominant) hand.
- 9) Claimant has severe limitations upon his ability to lift, carry, and handle heavy objects with his left, non dominant, upper extremity. Claimant's limitations have lasted for 12 months or more.
- 10) 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, one-armed 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 general, claimant has the responsibility to prove that he is disabled.

Claimant’s impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only claimant’s statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has an impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration

of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

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 may not be disqualified from 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 mean 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 (6th 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 he has significant physical limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling with his left, non dominant, upper extremity. 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 of 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 of 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 claimant 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 lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling with his left upper extremity as required by his past employment. Claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence to suggest 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).

This Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform simple, unskilled, one-armed light work activities. Light work is defined as follows:

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

There is insufficient objective medical evidence, signs, and symptoms to support a determination that claimant is incapable of performing the physical and mental activities necessary for a wide

range of one-armed light work. Claimant suffered a gunshot wound to his left upper extremity on [REDACTED]. He required open reduction and internal fixation. Claimant was seen by a consulting internist for the department on [REDACTED]. The physician provided the following conclusions:

Left Shoulder Injury

The patient does have diminished range of motion and atrophy of the left rotator cuff and shoulder joint due to his injury. He had relatively well preserved grip strength in the left hand as well as forearm and his range of motion was well preserved in these areas. Unfortunately, he is not remediable at this point. He is not undergoing any treatment.

The consultant indicated that claimant's dexterity was unimpaired. He was noted to be capable of picking up a coin, buttoning clothing, and opening a door. The physician did note atrophy of the left shoulder girdle with crepitation, tenderness, and atrophy of the supraspinatus tendon. The physician noted tenderness over the AC joint and over the glenoid process as well as labial area of the shoulder joint. There was noted to be atrophy of the biceps and triceps area. Range of motion of the joints was full. The consultant noted claimant's history of gunshot wound to the leg as well as pulmonary emboli. These were found to be stable and non contributory.

A careful review of the entire hearing record, including claimant's hospital records, a report from a consulting internist, and claimant's testimony as to his activities in his home and the community support the position that claimant is capable of performing simple, unskilled, light work activities which do not require the use of bilateral upper extremities. Claimant has failed to establish limitations which would compromise his ability to perform one-handed light work activities on a regular and continuing basis. It is noted that claimant's injury is in his left upper extremity and that claimant is right hand dominant. See Social Security Ruling 87-11c. The loss, or loss of use, of a hand or arm is not disabling per say. Federal law has held that an

individual who has loss or who has loss the use of a hand or arm can still engage in substantial gainful activity. See *Knott v Califano*, 559 F2d 279 (5th Cir, 1977). Claimant undisputedly has the full use of his right (dominant) hand and arm. Substantial evidence in the whole record supports the position that claimant is capable of performing one-armed light work activities.

Considering that claimant, at age 30, is a younger individual, has an 11th grade education, has an unskilled work history, and has a sustain work capacity for one-armed light work activity, the undersigned finds that claimant's impairments do not prevent him from doing other work. As a guide, see 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Table 2, Rule 202.17. Accordingly, the undersigned finds that claimant is not presently 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. In this case, there is insufficient medical evidence to support a finding that, despite the limitation of use of his left (non dominant) hand and arm, claimant is incapacitated or unable to work under SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant is not presently disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department of Human Services properly determined that claimant is not “disabled” for purposes of the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs.

Accordingly, the department’s determination in this matter is hereby AFFIRMED.



Linda Steadley Schwarz
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 10/19/09

Date Mailed: 10/23/09

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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LSS/dj

cc:

