

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.: 2009-18412

Issue No.: 2009/4031

Case No.: ██████████

Load No.: ██████████

Hearing Date:

June 15, 2009

Wayne County DHS (17)

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 telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on June 15, 2009. The Claimant appeared, along with ██████████, and testified. ██████████ appeared on behalf of the Department. At the Claimant's request, the record was extended to allow for the submission of additional medical records.

On August 17, 2009 and September 21, 2009, the additional records were received, reviewed, and entered in to the record as Exhibits 4 and 5 respectively. The records were from as early as 2001 while the others were duplicative of the original packet. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final determination.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA") and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") programs?

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 an application for public assistance seeking Medical Assistance (“MA-P”) and State Disability Assistance (“SDA”) benefits on January 12, 2009.
2. On February 11, 2009, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) determined the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefits. (Exhibit 1, pp. 3, 4)
3. On February 17, 2009, the Department sent an Eligibility Notice to the Claimant informing her that she was found not disabled. (Exhibit 1, p. 2)
4. On February 24, 2009, the Department received the Claimant’s written Request for Hearing. (Exhibit 1, p. 1)
5. On April 28, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) determined the Claimant not disabled finding her capable of performing other work. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant’s alleged disabling impairment(s) are due to chronic leg/ankle pain, hearing loss, headaches, and seizure disorder.
7. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment(s).
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 45 years old with an [REDACTED] birth date; was 6’2” in height; and weighed 189 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with a limited employment history of working in a bakery.

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)

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 general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a) An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an

individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a) The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6)

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) In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore is not ineligible for disability under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b) An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c) Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b) Examples 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.

Id. The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985) An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985)

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to a seizure disorder, chronic leg/ankle pain, hearing loss, and headaches. In support of her claim, some progress notes were submitted that show treatment for ankle/heel pain and swelling, headaches, seizures, chest pain, and lower back pain. In addition, older MRI test results from March 2005 and June 2007 were submitted which establish the Claimant had a benign cavernous angioma within the right medical temporal lobe. Further, a medical record from September 2001 was submitted which established that the Claimant underwent surgery to remove a right thyroid mass without complication.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the emergency room and treated after cutting off her right index fingertip while at work.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of headaches and dizziness, memory loss, and bilateral hand numbness. MRIs, both with and without contrast, were performed which revealed a stable benign cavernous angioma within the right medial temporal lobe consistent with the prior study on [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician submitted a letter of disability on behalf of the Claimant stating that she has been totally and permanently disabled thus is unfit for any sort of employment.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's neurologist authored a letter stating the Claimant has temporal lobe epilepsy with focus in the temporal lobe based on an MRI. Further, the letter states that the Claimant had an abnormal EEG noting her seizures are difficult to control. The neurologist noted that the Claimant experienced a generalized seizure where she passed out and fell therefore was advised to stop working and apply for social security.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent a rhinoscopy and excision of a papilloma lesion on her nose, lip, and tongue without complication. The final pathologic report found no evidence of dysplasia or carcinoma. The Claimant was released on [REDACTED].

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was examined by her neurologist who completed a Medical Examination Report on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was listed as seizure disorder. The physical examination noted a decreased right hearing but finding the Claimant in stable condition. The Claimant was found able to frequently lift/carry under 10 pounds; occasionally lift/carry 20 pounds; able to stand and/or walk at least 2 hours of an 8 hour shift with no limitations on the Claimant's ability to perform repetitive actions with any extremity. No mental limitations were listed.

On this same date, the neurologist completed a Medical Needs form with listed the Claimant's current diagnosis as seizure disorder. The Claimant was found unable to work any job due to the seizures not well controlled.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of headache, nosebleed, and dizziness. A CT scan of the Claimant's head both with and without contrast were

performed and found no evidence of hydrocephalus, mass deformity, or hemorrhage, and was otherwise unremarkable. An MRI of the brain, both with and without contrast, was performed and compared with the June 2007 study, revealing a stable benign cavernous angioma within the right medial temporal lobe, thus virtually the same as the previous test.

On [REDACTED], MRIs, both with and without contrast, were performed which found the heterogeneous medial right temporal lobe mass, compatible with a benign cavernous angioma essentially unchanged from the prior study. Ethmoid and left maxillary sinusitis as well as fluid in the bilateral mastoid air cells was also documented. The clinical diagnosis was of a right temporal lobe tumor.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented some medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical and mental limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, 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. The Claimant has alleged physical disabling impairments due to chronic leg/ankle pain, headaches, and seizure disorder.

Listing 1.00 defines musculoskeletal system impairments. Disorders of the musculoskeletal system may result from hereditary, congenital, or acquired pathologic processes.

1.00A Impairments may result from infectious, inflammatory, or degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events, or neoplastic, vascular, or toxic/metabolic diseases. 1.00A Regardless of the cause(s) of a musculoskeletal impairment, functional loss for purposes of these listings is defined as the inability to ambulate effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment, or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment. The inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively means an extreme loss of function of both upper extremities. 1.00B2c In other words, the impairment must seriously interfere with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. *Id.* Effective use of one's upper extremities means that individuals are capable of sustaining such functions as reaching, pushing, pulling, grasping, and fingering to be able to carry out activities of daily living. *Id.* Therefore, examples of inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively include, but are not limited to, the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level. *Id.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

- 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint(s) due to any cause: Characterized by gross anatomical deformity (e.g. subluxation, contracture, bony or fibrous ankylosis, instability) and chronic joint pain and stiffness with signs of limitation of motion or other abnormal motion of the affected joint(s), and findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging of joint space narrowing, bony destruction, or ankylosis of the affected joint(s). With:
- A. Involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively as defined in 1.00B2b; or

- B. Involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, wrist, hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively as defined in 1.00B2c

In order to meet a musculoskeletal listing, the impairment must present a major dysfunction and an extreme loss of function of one lower extremity or both upper extremities. In this case, the Claimant's objective medical evidence is insufficient to meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment within Listing 1.00 thus she cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, under this listing.

The Claimant asserts physical disabling impairment due to hearing loss. Listing 2.00 discusses special senses and speech impairments. Although the Claimant's hearing loss is mentioned in the Claimant's records, there was not treatment or indication that hearing aids were not helpful. During the hearing the Claimant was able to answer and respond to all questions without difficulty. Ultimately, in consideration of Listing 2.00 in conjunction with the objective evidence, it is found that the Claimant cannot be found disabled within Listing 2.00.

The Claimant also suffers from headaches and seizures. Listing 11.00 discusses adult neurological disorders. The criterion for epilepsy is applied only if the impairment persists despite the fact the individual is compliant with the antiepileptic treatment. 11.00A The severity of frequently occurring seizures is evaluated in consideration of the serum drug levels. *Id.* Blood drug levels should be evaluated in conjunction with all other evidence to determine the extent of compliance. *Id.* Listing 11.02 defines the requirements of convulsive epilepsy. To meet this listing, documentation providing a detailed description of a typical seizure pattern, including all associated phenomena, occurring more frequently than once a month, in spite of at least three months of prescribed treatment with daytime episodes (loss of consciousness and convulsive seizures) or nocturnal episodes manifesting residuals which interfere significantly

with activities during the day. To meet Listing 11.03, an individual's nonconvulsive epilepsy must be documented by detailed description of a typical seizure pattern including all associated phenomena, occurring more frequently than once weekly despite at least 3 months of prescribed treatment with alteration of awareness or loss of consciousness. Additionally, documentation of transient postictal manifestations of unconventional behavior or significant interference with activity during the day is required.

The record presented establishes that the Claimant suffers from headaches and seizures however these same records do not document treatment for continued seizures despite prescribed treatment. Ultimately, the objective medical documentation is insufficient to meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment within Listing 11.00. Accordingly, the Claimant cannot be found disabled under this listing.

The objective medical evidence establishes that the Claimant has a mass in her right lobe. Listing 13.00 discusses malignant neoplastic disease. Recent MRI/CT scans compared with studies from June of 2007 remain unchanged. There was no evidence of malignancy, biopsy, surgical intervention, or conversely, documentation establishing the mass is inoperable, metastasized, effects other body parts, and/or requires other treatment/therapy. Ultimately, it is found that the Claimant's impairment may meet a listing within 13.00 however the records are insufficient to meet the intent and severity requirement of listed impairment thus the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a)

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv) An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that

was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1) Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967 Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a) 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. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though 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. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.* Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c) An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and

sedentary work. *Id.* Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d) An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.* Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e) An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands (exertional requirements, i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a) In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparison of the individual's residual functional capacity with the demands of past relevant work. *Id.* If an individual can no longer do past relevant work the same residual functional capacity assessment along with an individual's age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an individual can adjust to other work which exists in the national economy. *Id.* Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions include difficulty function due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i) – (vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2) The determination of whether

disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.*

The Claimant's limited prior work history includes work in a bakery making pastries. The Claimant testified that she was on her feet most of the day and was required to lift/carry approximately 10 pounds. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior employment history is classified as semi-skilled, medium work.

The Claimant testified that she can lift/carry approximately 10 pounds; can walk for 10 minutes with assistance; and stand for approximately 30 minutes; and has no sitting limitations. The medical documentation notes less restrictive limitations finding the Claimant able to frequently lift/carry under 10 pounds and occasionally able to lift/carry 20 pounds; able to stand and/or walk at least 2 hours of an 8 hour shift with no limitations on the Claimant's ability to perform repetitive action with any extremity. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. 20 CFR 416.920 In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is not able to return to past relevant work as a pastry baker therefore the fifth step in the sequential evaluation will be addressed.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity and age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v) At the time of hearing, the Claimant, a high school graduate, was 45 years old thus considered a younger individual for MA-P purposes. Disability is found disabled if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the

analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983).

In the record presented, the total impact caused by the combination of medical problems suffered by the Claimant must be considered. In doing so, it is found that the combination of the Claimant's physical impairments have an impact on her ability to perform basic work activities. The Claimant is however, found to be able to perform the full range of physical and mental activities required for sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). The Claimant is a younger individual thus, after review of the entire record finding no contradiction in the Claimant's nonexertional limitations and in consideration of the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II], specifically 201.21, it is found that the Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5

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 continued 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 the Medical Assistance program and the State Disability Assistance program.

It is ORDERED:

The Department’s determination is AFFIRMED.

Colleen M. Mamelka

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

Date Signed: 09/30/09

Date Mailed: 09/30/09

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:

