

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: 2009-20699  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
June 16, 2009  
Newaygo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jay W. Sexton

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 June 16, 2009, in White Cloud. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

The department was represented by Kim Polasek (ES) and Norma Mulder (ES).

The Administrative Law Judge appeared by telephone from Lansing.

ISSUES

- (1) Did claimant establish a severe mental impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P) or 90 days (SDA)?
- (2) Did claimant establish a severe physical impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for one year (MA-P) or 90 days (SDA)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

(1) Claimant is an MA-P/Retro/SDA applicant (January 5, 2009) who was denied by SHRT (May 14, 2009) based on claimant's ability to perform a limited range of light work. SHRT relied on Med-Voc Rule 201.27 as a guide. Claimant requests retro-MA for October, November and December 2008.

(2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—39; education—high school diploma, post-high school education—3 semesters at [REDACTED] major); work experience—self-employed roofer (15 years), cook.

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since November 2008 when he was injured by a fall.

(4) Claimant has the following unable-to-work complaints:

- (a) Degenerative disc disease;
- (b) Ruptured disc;
- (c) Kink in neck;
- (d) Left shoulder dysfunction;
- (e) Bilateral carpal tunnel;
- (f) Bilateral knee dysfunction;
- (g) Status post fall from roof (June 2007);
- (h) Chronic back pain.

(5) SHRT evaluated claimant's medical evidence as follows:

**OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE (MAY 14, 2009)**

SHRT decided that claimant was able to perform a limited range of light work. SHRT evaluated claimant's disability using all the SSI Listings in 20 CFR 404, Subpart F, Appendix. SHRT decided that claimant does not meet any of the SSI Listings. SHRT denied disability based on claimant's ability to perform light work under 20 CFR 416.967(b).

(6) Claimant lives with his wife and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing (sometimes), bathing (needs help), cooking (sometimes), laundry and grocery shopping (needs help). Claimant does not use a cane, a walker, a wheelchair or a shower stool. He does wear arm braces while sleeping on a daily basis. Claimant did not receive inpatient hospital care in 2008 or 2009.

(7) Claimant has a valid driver's license drives an automobile approximately 8 times a month. Claimant is not computer literate.

(8) The following medical records are persuasive:

(a) A January 12, 2009 Medical Examination Report (DSH-49) was reviewed.

The physician provided the following current diagnoses: Bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome; herniated disc at L4-5.

The physician states that claimant is totally unable to do any lifting. The physician does not report any limitations in claimant's ability to stand, walk or sit. The physician states that claimant is totally unable to use his hands/arms for simple grasping, pushing/pulling, or fine manipulating. Claimant is totally unable to operate foot controls.

\* \* \*

(9) Claimant does not allege a mental impairment as the basis for his disability. Claimant did not provide any clinical evidence from a psychiatrist. Claimant did not provide a DHS-49D or a DHS-49E to show his mental residual functional capacity.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. Claimant testified that he has carpal tunnel syndrome, a ruptured disc, a kink in his neck and bilateral knee pain. The Medical Examination Report (January 12, 2009) states that claimant's diagnoses are: Bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome and a herniated disc at

L4-5. The physician states that claimant is totally unable to work. However, this MSO statement is contrary to the great weight of the medical evidence in the record and will not be given controlling weight. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

(12) Claimant recently applied for SSI benefits from the Social Security Administration. His application was denied. Claimant filed a timely appeal.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

### **CLAIMANT'S POSITION**

Claimant thinks he is entitled to MA-P/SDA benefits based on the impairments listed in paragraph #4, above.

### **DEPARTMENT'S POSITION**

The department thinks that claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform a limited range of light work.

The department thinks that claimant's vocational profile (younger individual, with a high school education and a history of unskilled work must be denied under Med-Voc Rule 201.27 as a guide.

### **LEGAL BASE**

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).

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).

**Claimant has the burden of proof** to show by a preponderance of the medical evidence in the record that his mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes. PEM 260/261. "Disability," as defined by MA-P/SDA standards is a legal term which is individually determined by a consideration of all factors in each particular case.

### **STEP 1**

The issue at Step 1 is whether claimant is performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). If claimant is working and is earning substantial income, he is not disabled for MA-P/SDA.

SGA is defined as the performance of significant duties over a reasonable period of time for pay. Claimants who are working, or otherwise performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA), are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The vocational evidence of record shows claimant is not currently performing SGA.

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 1 disability test.

**STEP 2**

The issue at Step 2 is whether claimant has impairments which meet the SSI definition of severity/duration. Claimant must establish an impairment which is expected to result in death, or has existed for 12 months, and totally prevents all current work activities. 20 CFR 416.909.

Also, to qualify for MA-P/SDA, a claimant must satisfy both the gainful work and the duration criteria. 20 CFR 416.920(a).

Since the severity/duration requirement is a *de minimus* requirement, claimant meets the Step 2 disability test.

**STEP 3**

The issue at Step 3 is whether claimant meets the Listing of Impairments in the SSI regulations. Claimant does not allege disability based on the Listings. However, SHRT evaluated claimant's impairments using all the Listings in 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix. Claimant does not meet any of the applicable Listings; therefore, claimant does not meet the Step 3 disability test.

**STEP 4**

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do his previous work. Claimant previously worked as a self-employed roofer in November 2008. He left work because he was injured when he fell from a roof.

The medical evidence of record establishes that claimant has degenerative disc disease and carpal tunnel syndrome. Since claimant must be able to climb, carry heavy objects up the ladder, and walk safely on a roof, he is no longer able to perform as a roofer.

Since claimant is no longer able to perform his previous occupation as a roofer, he does meet the Step 4 disability test.

### **STEP 5**

The issue at Step 5 is whether claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to do other work.

**Claimant has the burden of proof** to show by the medical evidence in the record, that his combined impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

First, claimant alleges disability based on a herniated disc at L4-5; bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome and bilateral knee dysfunction with pain. Although claimant is precluded from heavy lifting and constant standing on a roof, the record does not show that claimant is totally unable to perform any work.

Second, claimant testified that a major impediment to his return to work is his back pain, neck pain and knee pain. Evidence of pain, alone, is insufficient to establish disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant's testimony about his pain is profound and credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on his combination of impairments. Claimant performs several activities of daily living, drives an automobile approximately 8 times a month and has an active social life with his wife.

Considering the entire medical record, in combination with claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform simple, unskilled sedentary work (SGA). In this capacity, he is physically able to work as a ticket taker for a theatre, as a parking lot attendant, and as a greeter for [REDACTED]. Work of this type, will afford claimant a sit/stand option.

Based on this analysis, the department correctly denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application, based on Step 5 of the sequential analysis, as presented above.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant does not meet the MA-P/SDA disability requirements under PEM 260/261.

Accordingly, the department's denial of claimant's MA-P/SDA application is, hereby, AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Jay W. Sexton  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 21, 2009

Date Mailed: September 21, 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.

JWS/sd

cc:

