

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.: 2009-11820

Issue No.: 2009, 4031

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Load No. [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

March 16, 2009

Macomb County DHS (36)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held in [REDACTED] on March 16, 2009. The Claimant appeared. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. Patricia Bailey appeared on behalf of the Department. At the Claimant's request, the record was extended for further medical evidence to be submitted.

The additional evidence was received and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On April 29, 2009, the State hearing review team found the Claimant not disabled based upon insufficient evidence. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") retroactive from June 2007?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Claimant submitted a public assistance application on June 28, 2007, seeking MA-P benefits retroactive to March 2007.
2. On October 19, 2007, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) deferred the disability determination in order for additional records to be submitted. (Exhibit 1, p. 38)
3. On April 2, 2008, the MRT determined the Claimant was not disabled finding the Claimant engaged in substantial gainful activity. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
4. On April 12, 2008, the Department sent the Claimant, and not her authorized representative, an eligibility notice informing the Claimant that her MA-P benefits were denied.
5. In September 2008, the Department forwarded a copy of the eligibility notice to the Claimant’s authorized representative.
6. On December 11, 2008, the Department received the Claimant’s Hearing Request protesting the determination that the Claimant is not disabled.
7. On February 11, 2009, the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled based upon insufficient evidence. (Exhibit 3, pp. 1, 2)
8. The Claimant’s alleged physical disabling impairments are due to right, lower extremity cellulitis and carpal tunnel.
9. The Claimant’s alleged disabling mental impairments are due to bipolar disorder.
10. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 41 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 4’ 10 ½” and weighed 170 pounds.

11. The Claimant is a high school graduate with an employment history as a cashier.
12. The record was extended based upon the Claimant's request to submit additional medical documentation.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance ("MA") program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services ("DHS"), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, 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 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) The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913 An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a) Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929(a)

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicants takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3) The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2); 20 CFR 416.920a

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945 Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1) An individual's

residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv)

In addition to the above, when evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 20 CFR 416.920a(a) First, an individual's pertinent symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1) When a medically determinable mental impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual's significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2) Functional limitation(s) is assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2) Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication, and other treatment and the effect on the overall degree of functionality is considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1) In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining an individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(3) The degree of limitation for the first three functional areas is rated by a five point scale: none, mild, moderate, marked, and extreme. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4) A four point scale (none, one or two, three, four or more) is used to rate the degree of limitation in the fourth functional area. *Id.* The last point on each scale represents a degree of limitation that is incompatible with the ability to do any gainful activity. *Id.*

After the degree of functional limitation is determined, the severity of the mental impairment is determined. 20 CFR 416.920a(d) If severe, a determination of whether the impairment meets or is the equivalent of a listed mental disorder. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(2) If the severe mental impairment does not meet (or equal) a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(3)

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. An individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual is working and the work is a substantial, gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i) The federal regulations define substantial gainful activity as work that involves doing significant and productive physical or mental duties and is done (or intended) for pay or profit. 20 CFR 416.910(a)(b) Further, substantial gainful activity is work activity that is both substantial and gainful. 20 CFR 416.972 Substantial work activity is work activity that involves significant physical or mental activities and may be substantial even if it is done on a part-time basis or if the individual does less, gets paid less, or has less responsibility than when worked previously. 20 CFR 416.972(a) Gainful work activity is work activity that is for pay or profit. 20 CFR 416.972(b) Work activity is gainful if it is the kind of work usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized. *Id.* In general, activities such as caring for one's self, household tasks, hobbies, therapy, school attendance, club activities, or social programs, are not considered gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.792(c)

In the record presented, the Claimant continues to work part-time as a cashier for

██████████ As detailed above, an individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual is working and the work is a substantial,

gainful activity. Here, the Claimant's part-time employment at [REDACTED] is a substantial gainful activity therefore the Claimant is found not disabled at Step 1 with no further analysis required.

The State Disability Assistance ("SDA") program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code ("MAC R") 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in PAM, PEM, and PRM. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") program, therefore the Claimant's is found not disabled for purposes of SDA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance program and the State Disability Assistance program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Colleen M. Mamelka  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 05/05/09

Date Mailed: 05/05/09

**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 the Circuit 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.

CMM/jlg

cc:

