

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 200926329

Issue No: 2009/4031

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 29, 2009
Luce County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. Spodarek

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 July 29, 2009.

ISSUES

1. Did the DHS properly deny claimant's MA application?
2. Did the DHS properly propose to close claimant's SDA at review?

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 3, 2008, claimant applied for MA-P with the Michigan DHS. Claimant did not apply for retro MA.
2. On October 16, 2008, MRT approved claimant. In January 2009, claimant's case was reviewed and denied by MRT. Claimant appealed the denial.
3. On April 27, 2009, the MRT denied the MA-P and continuing SDA..
4. On April 30, 2009, the DHS issued notice.
5. On May 11, 2009, claimant filed a timely hearing request. The department should have reinstated the action pending the outcome of the hearing.

6. As of the date of the administrative hearing, claimant had been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA) on two different prior occasions. Claimant testified that he was alleging the same medical problems. Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. None of the exceptions apply.
7. On June 26, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant. Pursuant to claimant's request to hold the record open for the submission of new and additional medical documentation, on April 9, 2010, SHRT once again denied claimant.
8. As of the date of application, claimant was a 39-year-old male standing 5'11" tall and weighing 215 pounds. Claimant has 13 years of education.
9. Claimant does not have an alcohol/drug abuse problem or history. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that he quit smoking approximately three months prior to the administrative hearing. Previously, claimant was smoking a pack per day.
10. Claimant testified that he has worked for approximately 15 years in construction.
11. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of degenerative disc disease and back pain.

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).

Statutory authority for the SDA program states in part:

- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards,

except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

ISSUE 1

Prior to any substantive review, jurisdiction is paramount. Applicable to the case herein, policy states:

Final SSI Disability Determination

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
 - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**
 - .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. PEM, Item 260, pp. 2-3.

Relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until the determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(i). These regulations further provide: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the agency." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(ii).

ISSUE 2

Applicable policy and procedure with regards to the federal regulations as to a case at review, these regulations state:

...the medical evidence we will need for a continuing disability review will be that required to make a current determination or decision as to whether you are still disabled, as defined under the medical improvement review standard.... 20 CFR 416.993.

...You must provide us with reports from your physician, psychologist, or others who have treated or evaluated you, as well as any other evidence that will help us determine if you are still disabled.... You must have a good reason for not giving us this information or we may find that your disability has ended.... If we ask you, you must contact your medical sources to help us get the medical reports. We will make every reasonable effort to help you in getting medical reports when you give us permission to request them from your physician, psychologist, or other medical sources.... 20 CFR 416.993(b).

...In some instances, such as when a source is known to be unable to provide certain tests or procedures or is known to be nonproductive or uncooperative, we may order a consultative examination while awaiting receipt of medical source evidence. Before deciding that your disability has ended, we will develop a complete medical history covering at least the 12 months preceding the date you sign a report about your continuing disability status.... 20 CFR 416.993(b).

...If you are entitled to disability benefits as a disabled person age 18 or over (adult) there are a number of factors we consider in deciding whether your disability continues. We must determine if there has been any medical improvement in your impairment(s) and, if so, whether this medical improvement is related to your ability to work. If your impairment(s) has not so medically improved, we must consider whether one or more of the exceptions to medical improvement applies. If medical improvement related to your ability to work has not occurred and no exception applies, your benefits will continue. Even where medical improvement related to your ability to work has occurred or an exception applies, in most cases, we must also show that you are currently able to engage

in substantial gainful activity before we can find that you are no longer disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b).

Medical improvement. Medical improvement is any decrease in the medical severity of your impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision that you were disabled or continued to be disabled. A determination that there has been a decrease in medical severity must be based on changes (improvement) in the symptoms, signs and/or laboratory findings associated with your impairment(s).... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i).

Medical improvement not related to ability to do work. Medical improvement is not related to your ability to work if there has been a decrease in the severity of the impairment(s) as defined in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision, but no increase in your functional capacity to do basic work activities as defined in paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section. If there has been any medical improvement in your impairment(s), but it is not related to your ability to do work and none of the exceptions applies, your benefits will be continued.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(ii).

Medical improvement that is related to ability to do work. Medical improvement is related to your ability to work if there has been a decrease in the severity, as defined in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, of the impairment(s) present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision **and** an increase in your functional capacity to do basic work activities as discussed in paragraph (b)(1)(iv) of this section. A determination that medical improvement related to your ability to do work has occurred does not, necessarily, mean that your disability will be found to have ended unless it is also shown that you are currently able to engage in substantial gainful activity as discussed in paragraph (b)(1)(v) of this section.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iii).

As noted above, the analysis at review requires a seven step process. The first two steps require an assessment as to whether or not there was improvement and whether or not improvement is shown to be related to the individuals ability to engage in work. After careful review of the substantial and credible evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's condition has improved but has not been shown that it is related to his ability to engage in work or work-like settings. Thus, claimant is entitled to continuing statutory SDA.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that:

ISSUE 1

The department's denial of claimant's September 3, 2008 MA application was correct.

Accordingly, the department's denial of claimant's September 3, 2008 application is hereby partially AFFIRMED.

ISSUE 2

The department's denial of clamant's continuing SDA at review was incorrect.

Accordingly, the deparment's denial of continuing eligibility for claimant's SDA at review is hereby partially REVERSED.

The deparment is Ordered to schedule claimant's case immediately for a review continuing SDA eligibility.

/s/ _____
Janice G. Spodarek
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 21, 2011

Date Mailed: April 21, 2011

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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.

JGS/db

cc:

