

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: 2008-22248  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
July 23, 2008  
St. Joseph 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 in Centerville on July 23, 2008. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Janice Ferguson (FIM) and Carolyn Baker (ES).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

Claimant requested additional time to submit new medical evidence. Claimant's medical evidence was sent to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) on July 23, 2008. Claimant waived the timeliness requirement so that his new medical evidence could be reviewed by SHRT. After SHRT's second non-disability determination, the Administrative Law Judge issued the 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) or 90 days (SDA)?

(2) Did claimant establish a severe physical impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P) or 90 days (SDA)?

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/SDA applicant (March 24, 2008) who was denied by SHRT (June 17, 2008 and July 29, 2008) due to claimant's ability to perform unskilled medium work.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—51; education—high school diploma; post-high school education—none; work experience—maintenance/lawn mower for a golf course, welder for [REDACTED] and drill press operator.

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since he worked as a maintenance man and lawn mower for a golf course in 2005.

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

- (a) High blood pressure;
- (b) Passes out without warning.

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

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (JUNE 17, 2008):**

Based on a review of the medical evidence, SHRT thinks that claimant is able to perform unskilled medium work based on 20 CFR 416.967(c).

\*\*\*

(6) Claimant lives with a friend, and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dishwashing, light cleaning, mopping, vacuuming, laundry and grocery shopping. Claimant does not use a cane, a walker, a wheelchair, or a shower stool. He does not wear a neck brace or braces on his arms or legs.

- (7) Claimant does not have a valid driver's license, but he did drive to the hearing.

Claimant is not computer literate.

- (8) The following medical records are persuasive:

- (a) A May 15, 2008 Medical Examination Report (DHS-49) was reviewed. The physician provided the following diagnosis: Orthostatic hypotension and syncope.

The physician states that claimant can lift up to 12 pounds occasionally. Claimant is able to stand/walk less than 2 hours in an 8 hour day. He is able to sit about 6 hours in an 8 hour day.

Claimant is able to use his hands/arms normally. He is able to use his feet/legs normally.

**NOTE:** Claimant's treating cardiologist has given less than sedentary work restrictions based on claimant's physical impairments (orthostatic hypotension and syncope). However, this Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is inconsistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence in the record.

\*\*\*

- (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 did 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 of record does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. While it is true, that claimant's treating physician reports that claimant has severe work restrictions, this Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is inconsistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence in the record.

(11) Claimant has applied for federal disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. Social Security recently denied his application; claimant has filed a timely appeal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

**CLAIMANT'S POSITION**

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

**DEPARTMENT'S POSITION**

The department thinks that claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform a wide range of unskilled work.

The department thinks claimant is able to perform unskilled medium work based on 20 CFR 416.967(c).

**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).

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).

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 her mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes. PEM 260/ 261. "Disability," as defined by MA-P/SDA 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/SDA.

SGA is defined as the performance of significant duties over a reasonable period of time for pay. Claimant's who are working and 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.

Claimant meets the Step 1 eligibility 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/SDA, claimant must satisfy both the gainful work and the duration criteria. 20 CFR 416.920(a).

If claimant does not have an impairment or combination of impairments which profoundly limit his physical/mental ability to do basic work activities, he does not meet the Step 2 disability criteria.



Claimant does not meet the Step 2 severity and duration eligibility test.

**STEP 3**

The issue at Step 3 is whether claimant meets the Listing of Impairments in the SSI regulations. Claimant does not allege disability based on the Listings.

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

**STEP 4**

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do his previous work. Claimant previously worked as a maintenance man and lawn mower at a golf course. Claimant's [REDACTED] was medium work.

Except for the Medical Source Opinion (MSO) provided by claimant's treating cardiologist there is no evidence the claimant is totally unable to work.

Because claimant's Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is not supported by the great weight of evidence in the record, it will not be given controlling weight. 20 CFR 416.927(c) and 29 CFR 416.927(d).

Since claimant is able to return to his previous work, he does not meet the Step 4 eligibility 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/SDA purposes.

Claimant primarily alleges disability based on his syncope and his orthostatic hypotension. Claimant did submit a report by a cardiologist which indicates that he has a severe

physical limitation. However, claimant's Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is contrary to the great weight of the evidence in the record.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the medical record in conjunction with claimant's testimony, is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his orthostatic hypotension. Claimant currently performs extensive activities of daily living and has an active social life with his minor daughter. Taking the entire medical record as a whole, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform unskilled sedentary work (SGA). Claimant is able to work as bagger for a grocery store, as a ticker taker for a theatre, as a parking lot attendant and as a greeter for Wal-Mart.

The department correctly denied claimant's MA-P/SDA 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, decidesthe claimant does not meet the MA-P/SDA disability requirements under PEM 260/261.

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

SO ORDERED.

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

Date Signed: September 7, 2009

Date Mailed: September 21, 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.

JWS/sd

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names of the individuals listed in the 'cc:' field.