

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: 2009-26263  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
August 26, 2009  
Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ivona Rairigh

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 August 26, 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)?

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 March 4, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.

(2) On April 22, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant was capable of past relevant work.

(3) On April 29, 2009, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.

(4) On May 8, 2009, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

(5) On June 29, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) again denied claimant's application stating she was capable of performing other work, namely unskilled light work per Vocation Rule 202.24.

(6) Claimant submitted additional medical evidence following the hearing which was forwarded to SHRT for review. The new evidence did not change SHRT's previous decision as indicated in their August 31, 2009, determination.

(7) Claimant is a 39 year-old woman who is 5'7" tall and weighs 286 lbs. Claimant completed 12<sup>th</sup> grade and can read, write and do basic math.

(8) Claimant states that she last worked in 2006 or 2007 in a packaging factory job, work she did for 3 years on seasonal basis. Claimant has had factory jobs since 1995 with longest job lasting her 1 ½ years.

(9) Claimant currently lives from place to place with friends and relatives, her children give her some money, and she receives food stamps.

(10) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: asthma, obesity, diabetes, hypertension, arthritis, and gout, carpal tunnel in left arm, emphysema, depression, sleeping disorder, and lump on her lung.

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).

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 does 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 testified that she has not worked in couple of years. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment or a combination of impairments that is "severe". An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a

minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p).

The objective medical evidence on the record includes a March 1, 2008, Anachoice screen that was negative indicating that the claimant does not have lupus. Claimant's [REDACTED] drug screen was positive for marijuana, cocaine and alcohol.

On [REDACTED], claimant came to the ER and had an x-ray of her left forearm because she fell one week ago and continues to have pain. X-ray revealed a normal left forearm. Claimant also had a CT of her head on this date due to complaint of sudden onset of headache 2 days ago. This CT examination of the brain was normal. Claimant's lungs were clear to auscultation bilaterally without wheezes, rales, or rhonchi, and her heart was of regular rate and rhythm. Claimant had clear speech and a steady gait, full range of motion and 5 out of 5 strength of the right upper and lower extremities bilaterally. Pulses were present and equal, and sensation was intact in all 4 extremities.

On [REDACTED], claimant had a CT of her neck done for right-sided facial swelling. Impression was that of periodontal disease. X-ray of claimant's chest of [REDACTED] revealed no acute cardiopulmonary abnormality. Claimant also had a normal chest x-ray on [REDACTED]

Claimant's chest CT scan of [REDACTED], performed in ER showed no evidence of pulmonary embolus, thoracic aortic aneurysm or dissection. There was a 5-mm nodule at the left lung base laterally and followup examination was recommended in 4 months.

A doctor's visit on [REDACTED], for follow up on multiple medical issues and ER visit states that the claimant was sent to ER on [REDACTED], after complaining of chest pain. Claimant had a cardiac evaluation and her cardiac enzymes were negative, and her EKG

was negative for any myocardial ischemia. Claimant's chest pain had now resolved. Claimant has cut down her smoking to 1 pack every 3 days. Claimant's blood test did reveal a fasting glucose level of 139 and she was continued on medication for the diabetes. Claimant's knee pain is most likely arthritis and also most likely caused by her obesity. Claimant was advised on diet and weight loss for her elevated triglycerides. Claimant was taking Keflex antibiotic which the doctor felt was sufficient to clear up her tooth abscess.

Claimant was seen again on [REDACTED] and expressed various health issues. Claimant's blood pressure was 120/76, and her heart rate and rhythm were regular. Claimant's lungs reveal some slight diffuse expiratory wheezing but no splinting. Claimant needs dental help. Claimant reported chronic pain with her left knee. Claimant continues to smoke.

Medical Examination Report for [REDACTED], exam from a doctor that was seeing the claimant for the first time indicates as current diagnosis asthma, obesity, hypertension, tobacco abuse, depression and diabetes mellitus. Claimant's examination areas are normal except for periodontal disease, and history of asthma and 5 mm nodule on left lung base to be re-evaluated in 4 months. Claimant is quoted as saying she has lupus but ANA test for this condition was negative in February, 2008. Claimant also stated that she has occasional headaches that are possible migraine but that neurological exam was normal, and that she exhibits pleasant affect during the exam. No physical limitations were specified as the doctor notes that the claimant needs functional exam to adequately address such limitations. Claimant has no mental limitations.

Diagnosis was that of asthma, obesity, diabetes mellitus, history of lupus, chronic left knee pain, carpal tunnel syndrome on the left, and multiple dental issues.

Pulmonary function test of [REDACTED], showed evidence of obstructive lung disease which is moderately severe in degree, and possible emphysema.

New information claimant submitted after the hearing includes a note from After Care Plan that was apparently written sometimes in June, 2009 stating as one of the instructions “stop smoking”. Claimant continues to smoke as of the date of the hearing.

There is no objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical impairment. Claimant has listed numerous health conditions, however medical evidence does not support the conclusion that any of them rise to the level of being severely restrictive. Claimant definitely has issues with her lung function, but continues to smoke, and it appears her visits to the ER caused by impaired lung function are related to her unwillingness to stop smoking despite repeated medical advice to do so. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

There is no evidence in the record indicating that claimant suffers mental limitation. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon her failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where 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. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant’s medical record will not support a finding that claimant’s impairment(s) is a “listed impairment” or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR,

Part 404, Part A. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

At Step 4, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, the Administrative Law Judge would have to deny her again based upon her ability to perform past relevant work. Claimant's past relevant work was doing simple labor jobs such as packaging in a factory and other factory jobs since 1995. Finding that the claimant is unable to perform work which she has engaged in in the past cannot therefore be reached and the claimant is denied from receiving disability 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 other 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).

Medium work. Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform tasks from her prior employment, or that she is physically unable to do at the very least sedentary and light work if demanded of her. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity to perform other work. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform at least sedentary and light work. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual age 18-44 (claimant is 39 years of age), who is even illiterate or unable to communicate in English (claimant has a high school diploma)

and an unskilled or no work history who can perform only sedentary work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 201.23.

The claimant has not presented the required competent, material, and substantial evidence which would support a finding that the claimant has an impairment or combination of impairments which would significantly limit the physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(c). Although the claimant has cited medical problems, the clinical documentation submitted by the claimant is not sufficient to establish a finding that the claimant is disabled. There is no objective medical evidence to substantiate the claimant's claim that the alleged impairment(s) are severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disabled. The claimant is not disabled for the purposes of the Medical Assistance disability (MA-P) program.

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, page 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. The claimant

should be able to perform a wide range of sedentary and light work even with her alleged impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED, and it is SO ORDERED.

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ivona Rairigh  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 4, 2009

Date Mailed: November 10, 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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

IR 

cc: 