

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.: 2009-24652
Issue No.: 2009; 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
July 22, 2009
Wayne County DHS (49)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held in Detroit, Michigan on July 22, 2009. The Claimant appeared and testified, along with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Claimant submitted a public assistance application seeking MA-P and State Disability Assistance ("SDA") benefits on August 7, 2008.

2. On November 20, 2008, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) deferred the disability determination requesting a medical evaluation and the Claimant’s work history. (Exhibit 1, p. 1)
3. On December 9, 2008, the Claimant attended the department ordered examination. (Exhibit 1, pp. 3 – 11)
4. On January 16, 2009, the MRT determined the Claimant was not disabled finding the impairment(s) did not prevent employment for 90 days or more for SDA purposes and finding the Claimant capable of performing other work for MA-P purposes. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
5. On January 30, 2009, the Department sent the Claimant an eligibility notice informing the Claimant that the MA-P and SDA benefits were denied. (Exhibit 2)
6. On February 5, 2009, the Department received the Claimant’s Request for Hearing protesting the determination that he was not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
7. On June 10, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 4)
8. The Claimant’s alleged physical disabling impairments are due to hip and knee pain, osteoarthritis, hearing loss, high blood pressure, and seizures.
9. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment(s).
10. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 55 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’ 8½” in height; and weighed 190 pounds.
11. The Claimant has a limited education and work history providing general labor.
12. The Claimant’s impairment(s) has lasted, or is expected to last continuously for a period for 12 months.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (“MA”) program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services (“DHS”), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, 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”).

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) The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913 An individual’s subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a) Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929(a)

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant’s pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicants takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and

(4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3) The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2)

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945 Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1) An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv)

In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a) An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a) The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6) An individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual is working and the work is a substantial, gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i) In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b) An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c) Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b) Examples 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.

Id. The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985) An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985)

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to a hip/knee pain, osteoarthritis, hearing loss, high blood pressure, and seizures.

On [REDACTED], x-rays of the Claimant's hips revealed severe osteoarthritis in both hips. X-rays of the Claimant's lumbosacral documented degenerative changes in the lumbar spine. More specifically, mild disc space narrowing at L3-L4 and L4-L5, with degenerative endplate changes was found as well as, mild retrolisthesis of L3 and L4. Multilevel hypertrophic degenerative changes of facet joints were also revealed.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were listed as severe osteoarthritis of the hips and hypertension. The physical examination noted the Claimant's decreased range of motion in the Claimant's hips. The Claimant's condition was listed as deteriorating and his need for a walker was documented. The Claimant was found able to lift/carry 10 pounds and was able to stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8-hour workday.

On [REDACTED], an Audiogram was performed on the Claimant however the results were unclear.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a department ordered evaluation. The physical examination documented slightly decreased hearing. The Claimant had a cane but did not use it during the examination. A slight limp on the right side was noted however, the Claimant held onto the table while “slowly” performing a tandem walk, heel walk, and toe walk. The Claimant was able to squat 50% of the distance and bend to 90% of the distance, again while holding the table. Straight leg raise while lying was 0 – 40 and while sitting, 0 – 90. Ultimately, the Claimant was diagnosed with hypertension, stroke with right side weakness, arthritis, chronic back pain, seizures, and substance abuse. The Physician opined that the Claimant would be able to occasionally lift 10 to 15 pounds; stand or walk about 2 hours in an 8 hour day; sit about 6 hours during this same time; with no restrictions on the Claimant’s ability to perform repetitive actions with his hands/arms. The Claimant was found able to operate foot/leg controls but would experience difficulty with repetitive work because of his chronic joint pain. The Claimant need for an assistive device for ambulation was also noted.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented objective medical evidence establishing that he does have physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. Accordingly, the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant’s basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for twelve months therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis 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. The Claimant asserts physical disabling impairment(s) due in part to hip, back, and leg pain, as well as osteoarthritis. Listing 1.00 defines musculoskeletal system impairments. Disorders of the musculoskeletal system may result from hereditary, congenital, or acquired pathologic processes. 1.00A Impairments may result from infectious, inflammatory, or degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events, or neoplastic, vascular, or toxic/metabolic diseases. 1.00A Regardless of the cause(s) of a musculoskeletal impairment, functional loss for purposes of these listings is defined as the inability to ambulate effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment, or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment. Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. 1.00B2b(1) Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity function to permit independent ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s) that limits the functioning of both upper extremities. (Listing 1.05C is an exception to this general definition because the individual has the use of only one upper extremity due to amputation of a hand.) *Id.* To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to be able to carry out activities of daily living. 1.00B2b(2) They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. . . . *Id.* When an individual's impairment involves a lower extremity uses a hand-held assistive device, such as a cane, crutch

or walker, the medical basis for use of the device should be documented. 1.00J4 The requirement to use a hand-held assistive device may also impact an individual's functional capacity by virtue of the fact that one or both upper extremities are not available for such activities as lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling. *Id.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

- 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint(s) due to any cause: Characterized by gross anatomical deformity (e.g. subluxation, contracture, bony or fibrous ankylosis, instability) and chronic joint pain and stiffness with signs of limitation of motion or other abnormal motion of the affected joint(s), and findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging of joint space narrowing, bony destruction, or ankylosis of the affected joint(s). With:
- A. Involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively as defined in 1.00B2b; or
 - B. Involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, wrist, hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively as defined in 1.00B2c

The medical records which include medically acceptable imaging document the Claimant's severe osteoarthritis and need for assistive devices for ambulation. In addition, the Claimant's limitation of motion and pain is also medically documented. Further, the objective medical records establish the Claimant has a past history of substance abuse. In consideration of the Claimant's severe impairment(s) as detailed above, it is found that the substance use is not a contributing factor material to the determination of disability and the Claimant's functional limitations would remain independent of the abuse. 20 CFR 416.935 Ultimately, it is found that the Claimant's impairment(s) meets, or is the medical equivalent thereof, of a Listed impairment, specifically 1.02. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

The State Disability Assistance (“SDA”) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 et seq. and Michigan Administrative Code (“MAC R”) 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in PAM, PEM, and PRM. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (“MA-P”) program, therefore the Claimant’s is found disabled for purposes of continued SDA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance program and the State Disability Assistance program.

It is ORDERED:

1. The Department’s determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the August 7, 2008 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his representative of the determination.
3. The Department shall supplement the Claimant any lost benefits he was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.

4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in August of 2011 in accordance with department policy.

/s/

Colleen M. Mamelka
Administrative Law Judge
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 08/11/09

Date Mailed: 08/12/09

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 the Circuit within 30 days of the receipt 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.

CMM/jlg

cc:

