

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: 2009-13272

Issue No: 2009; 4031

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

May 5, 2009

Muskegon County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice 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 May 5, 2009.

ISSUE

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

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 8/12/08, claimant applied for MA-P and SDA with the Michigan DHS.
- (2) Claimant did not apply for retro MA.
- (3) On 12/16/08, the MRT denied.
- (4) On 12/30/08, the DHS issued notice.

(5) On 12/12/08, claimant filed a hearing request.

(6) Claimant has been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA).

Claimant testified that she hired an attorney who reapplied on her behalf. Claimant applied for SSI in approximately June of 2008. Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. None of the exceptions apply.

(7) On 3/16/09, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant on the basis of Medical Vocational Grid Rule 202.20. That decision is adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

(8) As of the date of application, claimant was a 45-year-old female standing 5' 4" tall and weighing 186 pounds.

(9) Claimant has an alcohol/drug abuse history. Claimant testified she quit smoking approximately one year ago.

(10) Claimant has a driver's license and can drive a motor vehicle.

(11) Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in 2007. Claimant's work history is unskilled.

(12) Claimant alleges disability on the basis of carpal tunnel syndrome, back spasms, hypertension, depression and anxiety.

(13) Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she requested a hearing to assist her in paying for medication which she cannot afford. Claimant stipulated at the administrative hearing that she did not have any evidence that she could not work.

#### 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.

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).

In this case, claimant's claim was considered by SSA and benefits denied. The determination was final as claimant indicated she hired an attorney and reapplied for benefits. At the time of the DHS application, claimant alleged the same impairments. None of the exceptions apply.

For these reasons, under the above-cited policy and federal law, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction to proceed with a substantive review. The department's denial must be upheld.

As noted above, should the SSA change its determination, then the new determination would also be binding on the DHS.

In the alternative, should the sequential analysis be applied, claimant would be denied for the reasons set forth in the SHRT decision--Medical Vocational Grid Rule 202.20. It is noted that claimant stipulated at the administrative hearing that she did not have any medical evidence that she could not work. Claimant lives alone. Claimant's age of 45 under federal law classifies claimant as a "younger individual." Based on claimant's biographical profile, Medical-Vocational Grid Rule 202.20 assumes that claimant can be re-trained. Statutory disability is not shown.

For these reasons, and for the alternative reasons stated above, statutory disability is not met pursuant to the federal guidelines found at 20 CFR 416.913(b), .913(d), and .913(e).

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is hereby UPHELD.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Janice Spodarek  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 15, 2009

Date Mailed: June 16, 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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.

JS/cv

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names of the recipients listed in the 'cc:' field.