

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: 2008-25301  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
October 23, 2008  
Monroe County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

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 on Thursday, October 23, 2008. The claimant personally appeared and testified with her daughter [REDACTED] as a witness.

ISSUE

Did the department properly deny the claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and retroactive Medical Assistance?

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 May 30, 2008, the claimant applied for MA-P and retroactive MA-P to February 2008.

(2) On June 24, 2008, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied the claimant's application for MA-P and retroactive MA-P stating that the claimant was capable of performing other work under 20 CFR 416.920(f).

(3) On July 1, 2008, the department caseworker sent the claimant a notice that her application was denied.

(4) On July 8, 2008, the department received a hearing request from the claimant, contesting the department's negative action.

(5) On July 30, 2008, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) considered the submitted objective medical evidence in making its determination of MA-P and retroactive MA-P eligibility for the claimant. The SHRT report reads in part:

The claimant has a history of back surgery, but the MRI in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not show disc herniation or spinal stenosis. She did have degenerative changes at L3-L4 and L4-L5. The 49 form indicated the claimant had a limp, but did not require an assistive device for ambulation. The 49 form indicated she had an absent Achilles reflex on the right, decreased range of motion and spasm. However, these findings would not support the significant level of limitation given on the 49 form. The claimant has asthma which seemed to be exacerbated by her job or work environment. The claimant's treating physician has given less than sedentary work restrictions based on the claimant's physical impairments. However, this Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is inconsistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence and per 20 CFR 416.927(c)(2)(3)(4) and 20 CFR 416.927(d)(3)(4)(5), will not be given controlling weight. The collective objective medical evidence shows that the claimant is capable of performing light work by avoiding exposure to excessive smoke, steam and dust.

The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light work. The claimant is unable to return to her past work because of her asthma. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile (younger individual, 12<sup>th</sup> grade education, and history of working as a cook), MA-P is denied

using Vocational Rule 202.20 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.

(6) During the hearing on October 23, 2008, the claimant requested permission to submit additional medical information that needed to be reviewed by SHRT. Additional medical information was received from the local office on January 21, 2009 and March 25, 2009 and forwarded to SHRT for review on January 23, 2009 and March 30, 2009.

(7) On February 5, 2009, the SHRT considered the newly submitted objective medical evidence in making its determination of MA-P and retroactive MA-P. The SHRT report reads in part:

The claimant is 47 years-old with 12 years of education and an unskilled work history. The claimant is alleging disability due to chronic pulmonary insufficiency, asthma, and back pain. The claimant did not applicable Social Security listings 1.01 and 3.01. There was insufficient evidence where a complete physical independent consultative examination was required with a pulmonary function study.

(8) On April 7, 2009, the SHRT considered the newly submitted objective medical evidence in making its determination of MA-P and retroactive MA-P. The SHRT report reads in part:

The claimant is alleging disability due to chronic pulmonary insufficiency (COPD), asthma, and back pain. The claimant is 48 years-old and has a 12<sup>th</sup> grade education with a history of unskilled work. The claimant did not meet applicable Social Security listings in CFR 404, Subpart P. The claimant was capable of performing other work that was sedentary under Vocational Grid Rule 201.18 as a guide. The claimant's lungs were clear on exam in [REDACTED]. Pulmonary function study showed her best FEV1 was 1.78, which is above the listing level of 1.35 or less for her height.

(9) The claimant is a 48 year-old woman whose date of birth is [REDACTED]. The claimant is 5' 7" tall and weighs 183 pounds. The claimant has gained 43 pounds in the past year because of her medication. The claimant has a high school diploma. The claimant was last

employed as a dietary aide/cook on March 10, 2008, which is her pertinent work history at the light level.

(10) The claimant's alleged impairments are COPD and degenerative lumbar spondylosis.

### 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).

"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.

...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).

...[The impairment]...must have lasted or must be expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. We call this the duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.909.

...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).

...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).

...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 record must show a severe impairment] which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities.... 20 CFR 416.920(c).

...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).

...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).

...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).

...Evidence that you submit or that we obtain 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 your impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what you can still do despite impairment(s), and your physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

...In deciding whether you are disabled, we will always consider the medical opinions in your case record together with the rest of the relevant evidence we receive. 20 CFR 416.927(b).

After we review all of the evidence relevant to your claim, including medical opinions, we make findings about what the evidence shows. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

...If all of the evidence we receive, including all medical opinion(s), is consistent, and there is sufficient evidence for us to decide whether you are disabled, we will make our determination or decision based on that evidence. 20 CFR 416.927(c)(1).

...If any of the evidence in your case record, including any medical opinion(s), is inconsistent with other evidence or is internally inconsistent, we will weigh all of the evidence and see whether we can decide whether you are disabled based on the evidence we have. 20 CFR 416.927(c)(2).

[As Judge]...We are responsible for making the determination or decision about whether you meet the statutory definition of disability. In so doing, we review all of the medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement that you are disabled.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

...A statement by a medical source that you are "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that we will determine that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

...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).

...Your residual functional capacity is what you can still do despite limitations. If you have more than one impairment, we will consider all of your impairment(s) of which we are aware. We will consider your ability to meet certain demands of jobs, such as physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements, and other functions, as described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section. Residual functional capacity is an assessment based on all of the relevant evidence.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

...This assessment of your remaining capacity for work is not a decision on whether you are disabled, but is used as the basis for determining the particular types of work you may be able to do despite your impairment(s).... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

...In determining whether you are disabled, we will consider all of your symptoms, including pain, and the extent to which your symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with objective medical evidence, and other evidence.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...In evaluating the intensity and persistence of your symptoms, including pain, we will consider all of the available evidence, including your medical history, the medical signs and laboratory findings and statements about how your symptoms affect you... We will then determine the extent to which your alleged functional limitations or restrictions due to pain or other symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with the medical signs and laboratory findings and other evidence to decide how your symptoms affect your ability to work.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

If you have more than one impairment, we will consider all of your impairments of which we are aware. We will consider your ability to meet certain demands of jobs, such as physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements, and other functions as described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section. Residual functional capacity is an assessment based upon all of the relevant evidence. This assessment of your capacity for work is not a decision on whether you are disabled but is used as a basis for determining the particular types of work you may be able to do despite your impairment. 20 CFR 416.945.

...When we assess your physical abilities, we first assess the nature and extent of your physical limitations and then determine your residual functional capacity for work activity on a regular and continuing basis. A limited ability to perform certain physical demands of work activity, such as sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, pulling, or other physical functions



(including manipulative or postural functions, such as reaching, handling, stooping or crouching), may reduce your ability to do past work and other work. 20 CFR 416.945(b).

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). At Step 1, the claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since March 10, 2008. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

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.

The objective medical evidence on the record further substantiates the following:

On [REDACTED], the claimant was given an independent medical examination by the [REDACTED]. The independent medical consultant’s impression was that the claimant has a history of COPD which was work-related. The claimant did have environmental exposure to toxins that were there during a period of construction. The claimant never had a history of smoking and never had a history of asthma. The claimant has not been followed up by an environmental specialist either. The claimant has a history of chronic back pain and did have

previous back surgery. The claimant had a normal blood pressure at 112/70 with a pulse of 84. The claimant's chest was symmetrical and equal to expansion respiratorally. The claimant's lung fields were clear to auscultation and percussion bilaterally. There were no rales, rhonchi, or wheezes noted. There was no retraction noted or accessory muscle usage or cyanosis. There was no cough. The claimant had mild tenderness to palpation of the lower lumbar area. There was no obvious spinal deformity, swelling, or muscle spasm noted. The claimant's pedal pulses were 2+ bilaterally. There was no calf tenderness, clubbing, edema, varicose veins, brawny erythema, stasis dermatitis, chronic leg ulcers, and muscle atrophy or joint deformity or enlargement. The claimant does not use a cane or aid for walking. The claimant was able to get on and off the table without difficulty. Gait and stance were normal. Tandem walk, heel walk, and toe walk were done without difficulty. The claimant was able to squat at 50% of the distance and recover and bend to 60% of the distance and recover. The claimant's grip strength was equal bilaterally. Gross and fine dexterity appeared bilaterally intact. Abduction of the shoulder was 0-150. Flexion of the knees was 0-150. Straight leg raise while lying was 0-50, while sitting was 0-90. Based on the examination, the claimant could occasionally lift and carry 10-15 pounds. The claimant should be able to stand and/or walk about four to five hours in an eight hour day. The claimant is able to sit about six hours of an eight hour day. The claimant was able to do simple grasping, reaching, pushing, pulling, and fine manipulation. The claimant was able to operate foot and leg controls occasionally. The claimant should avoid toxins, fumes, and exposure to pollutants as well extremes of weather. The claimant's FEV was 1.58, 1.78, and 1.51.

(Department Exhibit 1-12)

On [REDACTED], the claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] with a discharge date of [REDACTED]. The claimant's primary diagnosis was COPD exacerbation. The claimant's secondary diagnosis was hypertension and anxiety. The claimant had a blood pressure of 110/57 with a pulse of 62 with respiration of 20, and pulse ox of 96% with 3 liters of oxygen. The claimant apparently stopped taking steroids approximately five days prior to admission. She suffered having gradual onset of shortness of breath associated with a cough for one day. The claimant was restarted on her medication and discharged home in stable condition. (Department Exhibit 29-30)

On [REDACTED] the claimant's treating physician submitted a Medical Examination Report, DHS-49, for the claimant. The claimant was first examined in 1988 and last examined on [REDACTED]. The claimant had a history of impairment, chief complaint, and current diagnosis of asthma/COPD, vasodepressor syncope, and lumbar radiculopathy. On physical examination the claimant's blood pressure was 118/73. The claimant had a right-sided limp and back pain. Respiratorally, the claimant had wheezing, rhonchi with increased effort and positive accessory muscles. The claimant had back spasm with decreased range of motion in the L5 region. Neurologically, the claimant had a right Achilles DTR 0/4. (Department Exhibit G)

The treating physician's clinical impression was the claimant was deteriorating with limitations that were expected to last more than 90 days. The claimant could occasionally lift ten pounds, but never twenty pounds. The claimant could stand and/or walk two hours of an eight hour workday and sit less than six hours of an eight hour workday. There were no assistive devices medically required or needed for ambulation. The claimant could use both hands/arms and feet/legs for repetitive action. The medical findings that support the above physical limitation was a ruptured lumbar disc S/P lumbar laminectomy, a ruptured cervical disc S/P

cervical laminectomy, and moderate COPD. The claimant did not have any mental limitations and she could meet her needs in the home. (Department Exhibit H)

At Step 2, the objective medical evidence in the record indicates that the claimant has established that she has a severe impairment. The claimant has work-related COPD where she should avoid toxins, fumes, exposure to pollutants, as well as extremes of weather. The claimant had previous back surgery where she still has chronic back pain, but the claimant does not use an assistive device, and gait and stance were normal during her physical examination on [REDACTED]. The claimant's treating physician did say that she had a right-sided limp and back pain on [REDACTED]. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 2. However, this Administrative Law Judge will proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine disability because Step 2 is a *de minimus* standard.

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). This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant's impairments do not rise to the level necessary to be listed as disabling by law. Therefore, the claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 3.

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 the claimant does have a driver's license and does drive. She has a hard time driving at night because it is hard to see and she has to stop. The claimant cooks twice a week, but has a hard time breathing. The claimant grocery shops once or twice a month, but has a hard time walking where she loses her breath. The claimant does not clean her own home, do any outside work, or have any hobbies. The claimant felt that her condition has worsened in the past year because she has had two to three hospital visits where her airways will not stay open.

The claimant sleeps for two to three hours and then does a nebulizer. She gets up between 4:00 to 5:00 a.m. where she had breakfast. She watches TV. She goes to bed between 12:00 midnight to 1:00 a.m.

The claimant felt that she could walk one block. The longest she felt she could stand was 30 minutes. The longest she felt she could sit was two to three hours. The heaviest weight she felt she could carry was 10 pounds. The claimant does not smoke nor has ever smoked or done illegal or illicit drugs. The claimant used to drink socially, but doesn't anymore.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant has established that she cannot perform any of her prior work. The claimant was previously employed as a dietary aide/cook, which would require her to be around extremes in temperature in a kitchen environment. With the claimant's current issues with her COPD, she cannot work around toxins, extremes in temperature, fumes, and exposure to pollutants. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 4. However, the Administrative Law Judge will still proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not the claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

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 you 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.

...To determine the physical exertion requirements of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor.... 20 CFR 416.967.

**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).

**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).

...To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, you must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. If someone can do light work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary work, unless there are additional limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. 20 CFR 416.967(b).

The claimant has submitted insufficient evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her previous employment or that she is physically unable to do any tasks demanded of her. The claimant's testimony as to her limitation indicates her limitations are exertional.

At Step 5, the claimant should be able to meet the physical requirements of light work, based upon the claimant's physical abilities. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual, high school education and an unskilled work history, who is limited to light work, is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 202.20. Using the Medical-Vocational guidelines as a framework for making this decision and after giving full consideration to the claimant's physical and mental impairments, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant can still perform a wide range of light activities that does not involve working around toxins, fumes, pollutants, and extremes of weather and that the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA program.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department has appropriately established that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied the claimant's application for MA-P and retroactive MA-P. The claimant should be able to perform any level of light work that does not involve working around toxins, fumes, pollutants, and extremes of weather. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.



Accordingly, the department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carmen G. Fahie  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 15, 2009

Date Mailed: June 15, 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 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.

CGF/vmc

cc:

