

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: 2008-30430  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
December 3, 2008  
Muskegon 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 Muskegon on December 3, 2008. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Karen Willet (FIM).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

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/retro/SDA applicant (June 13, 2008) who was denied by SHRT (September 22, 2008) based on claimant's failure to establish an impairment which meets the department's severity and duration requirements. SHRT relied on Med-Voc Rule 201.21 as a guide. Claimant requests retro-MA for March, April and May 2008.

(2) [REDACTED]

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since February 2004 when he was a cook [REDACTED]

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

- (a) Status post left ankle surgery (February 2008);
- (b) Left ankle pain;
- (c) Left ankle physical therapy;
- (d) Left knee arthritis.

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

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (September 22, 2008)**

Treatment note of 6/26/2008 reported claimant had been feeling well and was without complaints. His physical examination was within normal limits with the exception of his blood pressure which was elevated. He reported that he had run out of his medications (page 144).

Orthopedic note of 6/25/2008 reported claimant continued to have pain (left ankle), although his x-rays demonstrated good healing progress (page 123).

Myoview stress test of 2/2008 reported some very mild changes (page 81).

**ANALYSIS:**

Claimant suffered a fracture of his ankle that is healing. Claimant's condition has improved. There is no evidence of any organ

damages as the result of hypertension or of diabetes. There was evidence of mild changes in a heart test, but no evidence of limitations related to these changes. He should be capable of performing a wide range of sedentary work, until his healing and therapy for his ankle are complete. At which time, he should be capable of performing a wide range of medium work, if not a full range of work.

Medical opinion was considered in light of CFR 416.927. The evidence in the file does not demonstrate any other impairments that would pose any significant limitation.

\*\*\*

(6) Claimant lives with a friend and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dishwashing, light cleaning, laundry and grocery shopping (uses an electric cart). Claimant uses a cane on a daily basis. Claimant uses a shower stool approximately 16 times a month. Claimant wears a brace on his left knee and left ankle on a daily basis. Claimant received inpatient hospitalization in February 2008 for left ankle surgery.

(7) Claimant has a valid driver's license and drives approximately 3 times a month. Claimant is computer literate.

(8) The following medical records are persuasive:

(a) SHRT's summary of claimant's medical evidence is presented at paragraph #5, above.

(9) There are no psychological/psychiatric reports in the record. Claimant does not allege a mental impairment as the basis for disability.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The medical record shows the following diagnoses: heart disease; diabetes; high blood pressure; and a broken left ankle. The medical records show that claimant was successfully treated for his left ankle fracture in February 2008 and that his condition is

improving. The medical reports in the record do not establish that claimant is totally unable to work at this time.

(11) Claimant recently applied for federal disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. Social Security denied his application; claimant 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 capacity to perform a wide range of sedentary work until his left ankle is completely healed.

The department denied claimant's MA-P application based on claimant's vocational profile (younger individual, high school education, and history of skilled work as a cook). The department relied on Med-Voc Rule 201.21 as a guide.

The department denied SDA based on PEM 261 because the nature and severity of claimant's impairments do not preclude all work activity for 90 days.

### 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 his 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. Claimants who are working, or otherwise performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA), are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The vocational evidence of record shows that claimant is not currently performing SGA. Therefore, claimant meets the Step 1 disability test.

**STEP 2**

The issue at Step 2 is whether claimant has impairments which meet the SSI definition of severity/duration.

Claimant must establish that he has an impairment which is expected to result in death, has lasted for at least 12 months and totally prevents all current work activities. 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).

Since the severity/duration requirement is *de minimus*, claimant meets the Step 2 disability 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 disability test.

**STEP 4**

The issue at step 4 is whether claimant is able to do his pervious work. Claimant previously worked as a cook [REDACTED] This work was light work.

The medical evidence of record establishes that claimant is unable to stand for long periods of time due to an injury to his left ankle in February 2008. Since claimant does not have the ability to stand for an 8 hour shift he is unable to return to his previous job as a cook for

[REDACTED]

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 4 disability 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 of record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

First, claimant does not allege disability based on a mental impairment.

Second, claimant alleges disability based on the injury to his left ankle in February 2008 in combination with a history of heart disease, diabetes and high blood pressure. The medical evidence of record does not establish that claimant's left ankle fracture would totally preclude substantial gainful work. It does show that claimant is not currently able to lift large amounts or stand continuously for 8 hours. There is no evidence of any organ damage as the result of claimant's hypertension or diabetes. There is evidence of mild changes pursuant to a heart test, but no evidence of limitations related to these changes.

Third, claimant alleges disability based on left ankle and knee pain. Unfortunately, evidence of pain, alone, is insufficient to establish disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant's testimony about his pain is profound and credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his status post left ankle fracture and injury in combination with his heart disease, diabetes and high blood pressure. Claimant currently performs many activities of daily living and has an active social life with his live-in partner. Also, claimant is computer literate. Considering

the entire medical record, in combination with claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform simple, unskilled sedentary work (SGA). In this capacity, he is able to work as a ticket taker for a theater, as a parking lot attendant, as a greeter for [REDACTED] and as a telemarketer representative.

Based on the foregoing analysis, 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, decides that 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: December 29, 2008

Date Mailed: January 5, 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.

JWS/kgw

[REDACTED]