

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: 2009-18289
Issue No: 2009; 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
June 16, 2009
Montcalm 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 16, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Also appearing and testifying on claimant's behalf was his sister [REDACTED].

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:

(1) On December 22, 2008, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.

(2) On January 5, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work.

(3) On January 8, 2009, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

(4) On February 25, 2009, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

(5) On April 29, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating his impairment/condition was non-severe per 20 CFR 416.920 (c).

(6) Claimant is a 52 year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5' 10 ½" tall and weighs 160 pounds. Claimant attended the 10th grade and does not have a GED. Claimant is able to read, write and do basic math.

(7) Claimant states that he last worked in year 2007 as a contractor in construction work, job he held for 8 years and that ended because he could no longer carry heavy building materials due to physical problems, and also because the owner of the business he worked for died. Claimant has held labor type jobs for most of his adult life.

(8) Claimant currently lives with his sister and receives food stamps. Claimant does not have a driver's license due to repeated DUI offenses, and currently drinks alcohol couple of times per week, 6 to 12 beers at the time.

(9) Claimant alleges as disabling impairment rheumatoid arthritis.

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).

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 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 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).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and testified that he has not worked since year 2007. 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 that has lasted or is expected to last for duration of at least 12 months.

The objective medical evidence on the record includes an Emergency Room Physician's Report of [REDACTED] showing claimant came in with complaints of right shoulder pain radiating down right arm after doing a lot of over head work the day before with his arms while taking down the Christmas lights. Physical exam showed no abnormalities except pain to palpation of right shoulder. Claimant's deep tendon reflexes were 2+, his muscle strength was 5 over 5 bilateral upper extremities, and he had no noted neurosensory deficits. Final diagnosis was that of right shoulder sprain/strain for which he was given Naprosyn and Norflex.

On [REDACTED], claimant was again seen in the Emergency Room with complaints of pain and swelling in the right hand that started after he was helping a friend do some work and

the friend hit his hand with a hammer. Claimant was intoxicated and stated he has had at least 7-8 beers, last one being just prior to arrival. X-ray of claimant's right hand showed a minimally displaced fracture of the third metacarpal, midshaft. Claimant was told to take Motrin for the next few days, and as he was heavily intoxicated and it was cold out, hospital staff would not let him walk home.

On [REDACTED], diagnostic imaging of claimant's chest, bilateral hips and bilateral knees was performed due to claimant's complaints of cough and pain. No acute pulmonary process was identified. Left knee impression was that of stable appearance of sclerotic lesion proximal tibia since study of 2006. Right knee impression identified no acute process. Both studies of left and right hip were unremarkable.

Claimant was again seen in the Emergency Room on [REDACTED], after experiencing chest pain. Claimant stated he awoke with mild chest pain but began splitting wood, his chest pressure intensified while working causing him to rest. His pain did not subside with rest and he went to the local hospital. An echocardiogram was completed and impressions were that of normal left ventricular size and diastolic dysfunction, based primarily on the deceleration time. X-ray of claimant's chest revealed no evidence of acute cardiopulmonary pathology.

Claimant's hearing testimony is that he grocery shops once per month, does some house work, tends to a garden once per week, and that he is in daily pain for which he takes Ibuprofen, as he has no insurance for any other medication. Claimant also testified that he can walk 1 mile, but that he is getting worse as his knees collapse on him, he cannot lift, and chest pain is still there. Claimant's sister also testified that claimant's legs shake really bad when he puts pressure on his joints.

While this Administrative Law Judge considers the hearing testimony of claimant's alleged impairments, medical evidence must show some type of abnormalities that would cause such impairments. Review of claimant's medical record does not support a finding that claimant has some type of severe medical condition, either as it pertains to his alleged rheumatoid arthritis that is not cited in the record, or as it pertains to the chest pain he had experienced. Claimant was engaging in physical work when he was treated in the Emergency Room in 2008, and injuries caused by such work were of a temporary nature (i.e. shoulder strain after doing overhead work, chest pain after cutting wood, and hand injury after being hit with a hammer), and not caused by any chronic condition claimant has.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record combined with claimant's own hearing testimony about his physical condition 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. 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 construction work, job he claims ended due to his physical problems, but also due to the person employing him dying. No evidence of any work restrictions by a medical professional has been provided by the claimant to show he cannot perform construction work any more. 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, or possibly even heavy work. Under the

Medical-Vocational guidelines, an individual closely approaching advanced age (claimant is age 52), with limited education and an unskilled work history who can perform even only light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 202.10.

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 Program 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. PEM, 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 light, sedentary 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.

/s/ _____
Ivona Rairigh
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 2, 2009

Date Mailed: September 9, 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.

IR 

cc:

