

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: 2009-28387

Issue No: 2009; 4031

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

September 15, 2009

Macomb County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

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 September 15, 2009. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits?

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 January 16, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.

(2) On April 27, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work.

(3) On May 7, 2009, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

(4) On May 15, 2009, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

(5) On July 20, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommended decision: The objective medical evidence presented does not establish a disability at the listing or equivalence level. The collective medical evidence shows that the claimant is capable of performing a wide range of light, unskilled work. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light, unskilled work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of a younger individual, high school graduate and unskilled work history, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 203.29 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.

(6) The hearing was held on September 15, 2009. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.

(7) Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on October 26, 2009.

(8) On October 28, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating that claimant is capable of performing other work in the form of light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b) and unskilled work per 20 CFR 416.968(a) pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.17.

(9) Claimant is a 44-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 6' 2" tall and weighs 300 pounds. Claimant attended the 11th grade and has no GED. Claimant is able to read and write and is able to add, subtract, multiply, and count money.

(10) Claimant last worked December 2008 for [REDACTED] where he worked for 18 years as a janitor and he is currently on leave because he had a stroke.

(11) Claimant receives Food Assistance Program benefits and the Adult Medical Program.

(12) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: a stroke on [REDACTED].

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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).

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

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).

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 has not worked since December 3, 2008. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The objective medical evidence on the record indicates that a [REDACTED] physical examination indicates that on [REDACTED], claimant was 43 years old and was 5' 11" tall. He weighed 312 pounds. His pulse was 76 and his blood pressure was 110/70. His visual acuity without glasses was 20/30 in the right and 20/30 in the left eye. His chest was clear to auscultation. His neck had no bruits in the carotid area. His abdomen was soft and supple. In his extremities he had no edema. His heart had regular rate and rhythm. The claimant was alert, awake, and oriented x3. He was able to follow 2-step commands. In his cranial nerves the pupils were equal and reactive. Extraocular movements were intact. Visual fields were full. Fundi were normal. No gross facial weakness or asymmetry. Tongue and uvula were central. In his motor skills there was no pronator drift. Muscle strength was 5/5 in all muscles and all four extremities. Reflexes were 2 in the upper and lower extremities. Plantars were downgoing. Sensory was intact to pinprick and light touch. Coordination was intact in finger-to-nose. The claimant's gait was stable. He was able to walk on his heels and toes. He was able to do tandem gait. He was able to get up from a squatting position. He was able to get on and off the examination table. Straight leg raising was negative. There were no physical restrictions seen on the examination on October 9, 2009.

An [REDACTED] medical report indicates that the claimant should be able to work eight hours per day. There was no limitation on walking or of the lower extremities. There was no limitation with carrying, pushing, or pulling. Hand grip was satisfactory bilaterally. He should be able to use bilateral hands for fine manipulation. There was no limitation on climbing stairs. However, climbing ropes, ladders, or scaffolds might be effected with the recent neurological

event and prefer to be avoided until complete stability is confirmed and established. He had a cerebrovascular accident. He had a history of limited basal ganglia bleed with significant recovery. There were no findings of aphasia, sensory, or motor. There was no evidence of disorganization of motor function, motor deficit, tremor, or ataxia. There was no disturbance of gross or dexterous movements or gait or station. There was no evidence of chronic brain syndrome. (p. 41)

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 the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant testified on the record that he lives with his mother and he is supported by his mother. He is single with no children under 18. He receives Food Assistance Program benefits and the Adult Medical Program. He does have a driver's license and drives 3 times per week to the store and usually drives about 2 miles. Claimant can cook frozen pizza. Claimant doesn't grocery shop and his stepfather usually does it for him. Claimant does clean his home by vacuuming and doing laundry. Claimant does mow the lawn with a push mower every 2 weeks. Claimant testified that he can walk a half a mile, stand for 45 minutes, sit for 2 hours at time, shower and dress himself, squat, bend at the waist, tie his shoes, and touch his toes. The heaviest weight claimant stated he can carry is 10 pounds and that he is fine mentally. Claimant testified that his level of pain on a scale from 1 to 10 without medication is a 10, and with medication he has no pain. Claimant does not smoke, do drugs, or drink alcohol. Claimant testified that his right arm hurts, but his legs and feet are fine. Claimant testified that in a typical day he wakes up and watches television, vacuums, eats dinner, plays poker on the computer, and watches television 6 hours a day. This

Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental or physical 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 medical evidence of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon his ability to return to his prior work. Claimant's past relevant work was light work as a janitor. There is insufficient objective medical evidence that indicates that claimant does not retain the residual functional capacity to perform his prior work. In fact, the medical reports in the file indicate that claimant does not have any physical restrictions. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again 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 some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior 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).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. The medical reports indicate that claimant does have any physical restrictions. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Claimant has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which

prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments.

Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. In addition, claimant did testify that he does receive relief from his pain medication. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. 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 light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 44), with a high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

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, p. 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. Claimant may request a referral to Michigan Rehabilitation Services as persons involved in Michigan Rehabilitation Services may be eligible for State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

/s/

Landis Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 22, 2010

Date Mailed: January 25, 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.

LYL/vmc

cc:

