

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: 2009-18270  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
June 18, 2009  
Alpena County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Marlene B. Magyar

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 18, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the department properly determine claimant is not disabled by Medicaid (MA) eligibility standards?

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 a married, 49-year-old mechanic/wrecker operator who has not been employed since 2004 when he was hospitalized at [REDACTED] (4/14/04-4/19/04) secondary to an acute myocardial infarction (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 5 and 52-53).

(2) Claimant had a greater than 20 pack per year smoking history at that time, but he reports he quit smoking and has not returned to it since (Department Exhibit #1, pg 52).

(3) On April 29, 2004, claimant underwent successful stenting of his left anterior descending artery (LAD) at [REDACTED] which reduced his stenosis to zero percent (Department Exhibit #1, pg 50).

(4) Claimant reportedly is a recovering alcoholic with a longstanding Hepatitis C diagnosis and cirrhosis of the liver, per his August 2008 hospital records (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 81 and 84).

(5) Claimant's July 8, 2008 CT scan showed mild adenopathy with no tumor mass in the liver and no enlarged spleen; a small non-obstructing left renal calculus was also noted (Department Exhibit #1, pg 83).

(6) Claimant's October 20, 2008 repeat CT scan showed little interval change from his July 8, 2008 study (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 63 and 64).

(7) On September 18, 2007, claimant was treated in Emergency Room (ER) because he tripped at home a couple days earlier; chest x-rays revealed he broke his left third rib and [REDACTED] was prescribed for pain while the rib healed (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 72 and 73).

(8) Per claimant's cardiac records, he underwent a stent redo of the LAD in 2006 (Department Exhibit #1, pg 20).

(9) A September 26, 2006 progress report notes claimant's cardiolute stress test looked "great" and recommended he get on an exercise program to deal with his deconditioning (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 20 and 21).

(10) Claimant currently stands approximately 5'9" tall and is medically obese at 265 pounds (BMI=39.1); he is right hand dominant.

(11) Claimant reported at hearing he is not currently taking any prescription medications.

(12) Claimant fell off a silo when he was 17 years old and now reports chronic back, right leg and hip pain cause him to be unable to do any type of substantial gainful work activity (Department Exhibit #1, pg 15).

(13) Claimant has no history of inpatient psychiatric treatment or counseling, and no severe/mental emotional impairments are evidenced by the medical records submitted to date (Department Exhibit #1, pgs 14-17).

(14) Claimant has a limited education (completed 9<sup>th</sup> grade) and his December 2008 psychiatric evaluation notes low normal to below normal intelligence based on claimant's report he cannot read well or handle his own banking; additionally, difficulty with simple calculations was noted (Department Exhibit #1, pg 16).

(15) Claimant's February 2009 CT scan notes splenic and gastric varices are now present (Exhibit A, pg 2).

(16) A follow-up scan was recommended in 3 or 4 months (Client Exhibit A, pg 6).

(17) Claimant does not have a hepatocellular carcinoma diagnosis, but he is being routinely monitored due to his high risk status (Department Exhibit #1, pg 83)(See also Finding of Fact #4 above).

### 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).

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

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 to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged, 20 CFR 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908 and 20 CFR 416.929. By the same token, a conclusory statement by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind is not sufficient without supporting medical evidence to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929.

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).

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).

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).

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).

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial gainful activity without good cause, there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

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).

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 is not disqualified from receiving MA at Step 1, because he has not been gainfully employed since 2004 (See Finding of Fact #1 above).

At Step 2, claimant's medically documented physical impairments, in combination, meet the *de minimus* level of severity and duration required for further analysis; however, it must be noted no severe mental/emotional impairments have been shown.

At Step 3, the medical evidence on this record does not support a finding that claimant's diagnosed impairments, standing alone or combined, are severe enough to meet or equal any specifically listed impairments; consequently, the analysis must continue.

At Step 4, the record supports claimant's contention he cannot return to his former heavy/medium exertional activities as a career mechanic/wrecker operator. As such, this analysis must continue.

At Step 5, an individual's age, education and previous work experience (vocational factors) must be assessed in light of the documented impairments. Claimant is a younger individual with a limited education and an unskilled work history. Consequently, at Step 5, this Administrative Law Judge finds, from the medical evidence of record, that claimant retains the residual functional capacity to perform at least light work, as that term is defined above. Consequently, claimant is not disabled under the MA definitions, because he can return to other light work, as directed by Medical-Vocational Rule 202.17.



DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department properly determined claimant is not disabled by MA eligibility standards.

Accordingly, the department's action is AFFIRMED.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marlene B. Magyar  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 30, 2009

Date Mailed: June 30, 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.

MBM/db

cc:

