

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.: 2009-20223

Issue No.: 2009

Case No.: ██████████

Load No.: ██████████

Hearing Date:

June 17, 2009

Macomb County DHS (36)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Linda Steadley Schwarb

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 hearing was held on June 17, 2009. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by ██████████

██████████. Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) program?

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 September 9, 2008, an application was filed on claimant's behalf for MA-P benefits. The application requested MA-P retroactive to August of 2008.

- 2) On December 12, 2008, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On March 10, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 42, has an eleventh-grade education.
- 5) Claimant last worked in August of 2008 running heavy equipment such as a chipper and chainsaw for a tree removal company. Claimant has also performed relevant work as a welder and die setter. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of work activities requiring a great deal of physical exertion.
- 6) On [REDACTED], claimant was a pedestrian who was struck by a 4-wheeler. He sustained multiple fractures and underwent open reduction and internal fixation of a distal radius fracture, clavicular fracture, and left tibial fracture. Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED].
- 7) Since the time of his injury and subsequent surgery, claimant has continued to experience problems with non-union of the left tibial fracture.
- 8) As of [REDACTED], x-rays documented incomplete healing of the left tibial plateau fracture. Claimant was reported to be at 50% weight bearing.
- 9) For in excess of one year, claimant has continued to experience non-union of his left tibia resulting in the inability to ambulate effectively.

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).

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“Disability” is:

...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

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, claimant is not working. Therefore, claimant may not be disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities.

Basic work activities means 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 purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he has significant physical limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, and handling. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant’s work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.


In the third step of the sequential consideration 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. Based upon the hearing record, the undersigned finds that claimant's impairment meets or equals the "listed impairment." See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A, Section 1.06. In this case, claimant suffered an injury on [REDACTED], which required open reduction and internal fixation of a left tibial fracture. As of [REDACTED], x-ray evidence continued to demonstrate that claimant had incomplete healing. Claimant's treating orthopedic specialist reported on [REDACTED], that claimant was maintaining weight bearing at approximately 50%. The physician noted that the x-rays documented no significant interval change from prior films despite the fact that claimant had been using a bone stimulator twice a day for some time. The record supports a finding that, due to non-union of claimant's left tibial fracture, claimant met or equaled a listing. Accordingly, it is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge that claimant is presently disabled for purposes of the MA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant meets the definition of medically disabled under the Medical Assistance program as of August of 2008.

Accordingly, the department is ordered to initiate a review of the September 9, 2008, application, if it has not already done so, to determine if all other non medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform claimant and his authorized representative of its

determination in writing. Assuming that claimant is otherwise eligible for program benefits, the department shall review claimant's continued eligibility for program benefits in June of 2010.


Linda Steadley Schwarz
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 3, 2010

Date Mailed: February 5, 2010

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.

LSS/pf

cc:

