STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Claimant

Reg. No:2009-16462Issue No:2009; 4031Case No:1Load No:1Hearing Date:1June 4, 2009Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ivona Rairigh

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 June 4, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Also appearing on claimant's behalf was his girlfriend who translated for the claimant from English to Spanish and vice versa.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

2009-16462

(1) On September 25, 2008, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance andState Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.

(2) On January 9, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work.

(3) On January 21, 2009, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

(4) On January 30, 2009, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

(5) On April 1, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team also denied claimant's application stating he was capable of performing other work, namely medium work per Vocational Rule 203.25.

(6) Claimant stated at the hearing that he had additional medical records to provide for review. Record was extended for 90 days, however no additional medical records were provided and record was closed on November 3, 2009.

(7) Claimant is a 47 year old man who is 6' tall and weighs 194 lbs., but claims his normal weight is 170 lbs. Claimant completed 6th grade, cannot read and write past 3rd grade level, but can do basic math.

(8) Claimant states that he last worked in June, 2008 for a temporary service doing landscaping and as a handyman, job that he could no longer perform after he had a car accident in this month. Claimant has performed factory and general labor jobs in the past.

(9) Claimant lives alone in a house that is in foreclosure, receives food stamps and some financial help from his girlfriend. Claimant has a driver's license and drives daily to the

store to get food, to do the laundry, to doctor's appointments, all around the store of the stor

(10) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: back, hip and neck, fibromyalgia, anxiety and depression, all caused by a car accident in June, 2008.

(11) Claimant has applied for Social Security disability and been denied, and reapplied with his application pending.

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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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 does 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 <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 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).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and testified that he has

not worked since June, 2008. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely

restrictive physical or mental impairment or a combination of impairments that is "severe". An

impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p).

The objective medical evidence on the record includes a medical examination report of August 28, 2008, performed upon request from **and based on** claimant's lawsuit pertaining to the car accident of June, 2008. Claimant related through an interpreter that he was a restrained driver of a vehicle that belonged to his friend, who was the front-seat passenger. Claimant was driving across the train tracks when a flashing signal turned on and he stopped immediately. A Jeep hit his rear bumper, closer to the driver's side, and he developed neck and back pain right away. The passenger apparently had no injury and claimant drove him home after exchanging information with the driver who hit them. Claimant reported the accident to the police the following day. Claimant was seen by his doctor on June 10, 2008 and an x-ray of his lower back was obtained, which showed no bony injury. Claimant was given medication and sent to physical therapy, which included ultrasound and exercises, twice per week for a total of 12 weeks. Claimant stated that the therapy did not provide any significant improvement.

Claimant reported his symptoms have worsened since the accident and described his pain to be 8/10 at the time of this exam. Pain was reported in the lumbar region, but also in the entire left lower extremity and neck. Claimant also stated that two days ago, he developed pain in the left side of his ribs, which made it difficult for him to breathe, and that such pain usually lasts six

hours. Claimant also complained of weakness in both knees, numbness of his bilateral lower extremities after prolonged sitting, but reported no bowel or bladder dysfunction. Claimant reported he is not able to stay asleep, has nightmares during sleep, his appetite was poor, he had shortness of breath, constipation, and bilateral temporal headaches intermittently.

Claimant reported to be self-employed in landscaping, work requirements to include lifting 5, 10 or 15 pounds per day. Claimant further stated that quite often, he will send his employees to work so he does not have to perform any physical work, although he has not been working since the time of the accident.

Physical examination revealed no deficit in cranial nerve. The cervical spine and upper extremities did not note to have any deficits. Pinprick examination reported to have no discrepancy, reflexes in the upper extremity were symmetrical, and manual muscle testing noted to have no muscle weakness. Claimant was able to get from sitting to standing position, to walk without support, and to walk on tiptoes and heels. Claimant reported aggravation of pain in his left foot in heel walk. Claimant was able to squat and recover, although when he stood up, he stated that motion had aggravated the pain in the left side of the abdomen right under the ribcage.

Claimant reported having pain during examination of his lumbosacral spine, both with flexion and extension. Claimant reported no deficit with sensory examination in the lower extremities. Claimant reported pain in the lumbar region, although hip and knee flexion against the trunk, again, reproduced the pain symptoms. Hip flexion, abduction, and external rotation maneuvers did not aggravate significant pain symptoms in the lumbar region. Although tenderness was reportedly produced by palpation along the ribcage, compression of the ribcage did not appear to aggravate pain symptoms. Claimant's abdomen was soft with normal bowel sounds and no rebound tenderness.

Impression was that claimant's clinical symptoms appear to be low back pain, reportedly related to the car accident he described. In the opinion of the examiner claimant's current presentation did not suggest radiculopathy. Claimant's ribcage pain and described symptoms of plantar fasciitis of the left foot are not related to the accident. Recommendation was that the claimant can resume his employment without an excused absence as of today's evaluation, without restrictions and in a full time capacity.

Claimant had an MRI done on October 11, 2008. Findings were that the cervical vertebral bodies are normal in height and alignment, no fracture or dislocation, mild intervertebral disk space narrowing at C5-6 level, but remainder of the disc spaces are normal, no significant hypertrophic changes, and soft tissues normal. Impression is that of degenerative disk disease at C5-6, with no fracture.

quotes the claimant

as saying his pain level is 5/10 in his buttocks (pinforms), but that he feels much better overall. It is noted that the claimant has made good progress, transitional movements are pain free, and he has minimal tenderness. Claimant was discharged to home exercise and walking program. Claimant does not need further rehabilitation at this time.

Claimant was seen in November, 2008 by his doctor and complained of continued back pain. Claimant also reported being depressed and anxious, having major memory problems, and being irritable according to his girlfriend. Claimant's physical exams did not reveal any significant abnormalities. Mental Status Examination indicates that the claimant was grossly oriented to person, place and time, his communication ability was within normal limits, his mood was normal, and affect appropriate. Claimant was diagnosed with low back pain, sciatica, anxiety disorder, major depression (recurrent), cervicalgia, and posttramatic stress disorder.

On November 20, 2008 claimant's doctor released him to return to work on January 12, 2009, with no restrictions.

Medical information also includes records of claimant's physical therapy appointments in 2008. No medical records after November, 2008 have been provided.

There is no objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

There is no evidence in the record indicating that claimant suffers mental limitation. Claimant did report to his doctor that he suffers from depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder, apparently based on his car accident in June, 2008. However, even though the claimant testified that he was involved with **status**, he provided no record of any mental health treatment. Claimant's own doctor stated that claimant's mental status examination was normal. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where 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).

At Step 4, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, the Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again based upon his ability to perform past relevant work. Claimant's past relevant work was doing landscaping. Claimant' own doctor released him back to such work effective January, 2009, with no restrictions. Independent examiner was of the opinion that the claimant could return to his previous work as of August, 2008 examination. Finding that the claimant is unable to perform work which he has engaged in in the past cannot therefore be reached and the claimant is denied from receiving disability at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform other jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and 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).

Medium work. Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform tasks from his prior employment, or that he is physically unable to do at least medium work if demanded of him. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity to perform other work. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform sedentary, light and medium work. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (claimant is age 47), with limited education, that is illiterate or unable to communicate in English, and an unskilled or no work history who can perform even only light

work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 202.16. Evidence presented does not establish that the claimant cannot perform more than light work.

The claimant has not presented the required competent, material, and substantial evidence which would support a finding that the claimant has an impairment or combination of impairments which would significantly limit the physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(c). Although the claimant has cited medical problems, the clinical documentation submitted by the claimant is not sufficient to establish a finding that the claimant is disabled. There is no objective medical evidence to substantiate the claimant's claim that the alleged impairment(s) are severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disabled. The claimant is not disabled for the purposes of the Medical Assistance disability (MA-P) program.

The department's Bridges Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, page 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either.

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 on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of sedentary, light and medium work even with his

alleged impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED, and it is SO ORDERED.

<u>/s/</u> Ivona Rairigh Administrative Law Judge

for Ismael Ahmed, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 5, 2010

Date Mailed: <u>April 6, 2010</u>

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.

