

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: 2009-2845

Issue No: 2009; 4031

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

January 7, 2009

Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

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 Wednesday, January 7, 2009. The claimant personally appeared and testified on her own behalf.

ISSUE

Did the department properly deny the 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 July 17, 2008, the claimant applied for MA-P and SDA without filing an application for retroactive MA-P.

(2) On August 15, 2008, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied the claimant's application for MA-P stating that the claimant was capable of performing other work under Medical-Vocational Grid Rule 202.22 (20 CFR 416.920(f)) and for SDA that the claimant's physical and mental impairment does not prevent employment for 90 days or more.

(3) On August 25, 2008, the department caseworker sent the claimant a notice that her application was denied.

(4) On October 9, 2008, the department received a hearing request from the claimant, contesting the department's negative action.

(5) On November 5, 2008, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) considered the submitted objective medical evidence in making its determination of MA-P, retroactive MA-P, and SDA eligibility for the claimant. The SHRT report reads in part:

The physician opined that any disability would be temporary with a return to work expected on August 25, 2008. The findings on MRI would not suggest a disabling impairment. Medical opinion was considered in light of CFR 416.927. The evidence in file does not demonstrate any other impairment that would pose a significant limitation.

The claimant retains the physical residual functional capacity to perform medium work. The claimant's past work in security as it is normally performed is light work. Therefore, the claimant retains the capacity to perform her past relevant work. MA-P is denied per 20 CFR 416.920(e). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per PEM 261 due to the capacity to perform past relevant work.

(6) During the hearing on January 7, 2009, the claimant requested permission to submit additional medical information that needed to be reviewed by SHRT. Additional medical information was received from the local office on January 7, 2009 and forwarded to SHRT for review on January 9, 2009.

(7) On January 14, 2009, the SHRT considered the newly submitted objective medical evidence in making its determination of MA-P, retroactive MA-P, and SDA. The SHRT report reads in part:

The claimant does have some degenerative changes in her spine. However, she had no significant neurological deficits. She was able to walk without assistance. The claimant's treating physician has given less than sedentary work restrictions until August 2008 based on the claimant's physical impairments. However, this Medical Source Opinion (MSO) is inconsistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence and per 20 CFR 416.927(c)(2)(3)(4) and 20 CFR 416.927(d)(3)(4)(5), will not be given controlling weight. The collective objective medical evidence shows that the claimant is capable of performing medium work.

The claimant retains the physical residual functional capacity to perform medium work. The claimant's past work in security as it is normally performed is light work. Therefore, the claimant retains the capacity to perform her past relevant work. MA-P is denied per 20 CFR 416.920(e). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per PEM 261 due to the capacity to perform past relevant work.

(8) The claimant is a 49 year-old woman whose date of birth is [REDACTED].

The claimant is 5' 1" tall and weighs 183 pounds. The claimant has gained 25 or more pounds because of lack of activity and pain. The claimant has a high school diploma and two years of college. The claimant can read and write and do basic math. The claimant was last employed as a security guard in December 2008, which is her pertinent work history. The claimant has also been employed as a shift crew leader.

(9) The claimant's alleged impairments are back pain and degenerative disc disease.

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).

"Disability" is:

...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.

...We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

...If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

...[The impairment]...must have lasted or must be expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. We call this the duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.909.

...If you do not have any impairment or combination of impairments which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, we will find that you do not have a severe impairment and are, therefore, not disabled. We will

not consider your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

[In reviewing your impairment]...We need reports about your impairments from acceptable medical sources.... 20 CFR 416.913(a).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

... [The record must show a severe impairment] which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities.... 20 CFR 416.920(c).

...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).

...The medical evidence...must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.
- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques. Psychiatric signs are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of

behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated.

- (c) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

- (1) The nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question;
- (2) The probable duration of your impairment; and
- (3) Your residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques.... 20 CFR 416.927(a)(1).

...Evidence that you submit or that we obtain 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 your impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what you can still do despite impairment(s), and your physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

...In deciding whether you are disabled, we will always consider the medical opinions in your case record together with the rest of the relevant evidence we receive. 20 CFR 416.927(b).

After we review all of the evidence relevant to your claim, including medical opinions, we make findings about what the evidence shows. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

...If all of the evidence we receive, including all medical opinion(s), is consistent, and there is sufficient evidence for us to decide whether you are disabled, we will make our determination or decision based on that evidence. 20 CFR 416.927(c)(1).

...If any of the evidence in your case record, including any medical opinion(s), is inconsistent with other evidence or is internally inconsistent, we will weigh all of the evidence and see whether we can decide whether you are disabled based on the evidence we have. 20 CFR 416.927(c)(2).

[As Judge]...We are responsible for making the determination or decision about whether you meet the statutory definition of disability. In so doing, we review all of the medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement that you are disabled.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

...A statement by a medical source that you are "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that we will determine that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

...If you have an impairment(s) which meets the duration requirement and is listed in Appendix 1 or is equal to a listed impairment(s), we will find you disabled without considering your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

...If we cannot make a decision on your current work activities or medical facts alone and you have a severe impairment, we will then review your residual functional capacity and the physical and mental demands of the work you have done in the past. If you can still do this kind of work, we will find that you are not disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

If you cannot do any work you have done in the past because you have a severe impairment(s), we will consider your residual functional capacity and your age, education, and past work experience to see if you can do other work. If you cannot, we will find you disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(f)(1).

...Your residual functional capacity is what you can still do despite limitations. If you have more than one impairment, we will consider all of your impairment(s) of which we are aware. We will consider your ability to meet certain demands of jobs, such as physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements, and other functions, as described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section. Residual functional capacity is an assessment based on all of the relevant evidence.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

...This assessment of your remaining capacity for work is not a decision on whether you are disabled, but is used as the basis for determining the particular types of work you may be able to do despite your impairment(s).... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

...In determining whether you are disabled, we will consider all of your symptoms, including pain, and the extent to which your symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with objective medical evidence, and other evidence.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...In evaluating the intensity and persistence of your symptoms, including pain, we will consider all of the available evidence, including your medical history, the medical signs and laboratory findings and statements about how your symptoms affect you... We will then determine the extent to which your alleged functional limitations or restrictions due to pain or other symptoms can reasonably be accepted as consistent with the medical signs and laboratory findings and other evidence to decide how your symptoms affect your ability to work.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

If you have more than one impairment, we will consider all of your impairments of which we are aware. We will consider your ability to meet certain demands of jobs, such as physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements, and other functions as described in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of this section. Residual functional capacity is an assessment based upon all of the relevant evidence. This assessment of your capacity for work is not a decision on whether you are disabled but is used as a basis for determining the particular types of work you may be able to do despite your impairment. 20 CFR 416.945.

...When we assess your physical abilities, we first assess the nature and extent of your physical limitations and then determine your residual functional capacity for work activity on a regular and continuing basis. A limited ability to perform certain physical demands of work activity, such as sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, pulling, or other physical functions

(including manipulative or postural functions, such as reaching, handling, stooping or crouching), may reduce your ability to do past work and other work. 20 CFR 416.945(b).

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“Disability” is:

...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

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). At Step 1, the claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since December 9, 2008. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities.

Basic work activities means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

The objective medical evidence on the record further substantiates the following:

On [REDACTED], the claimant’s treating physician completed a Medical Examination Report, DHS-49, for the claimant. The claimant was first examined on [REDACTED] and last examined on [REDACTED]. The claimant had a history of impairment and chief complaint of muscle spasms and leg swelling since a fall in November 2007. The claimant had a current diagnosis of spondylosis of the lumbar spine and cervical disk bulge. The claimant had a normal physical examination except that the treating physician noted that the claimant had an ambling

gait with decreased sacrolumbar range of motion bilaterally to 40 degrees with strength at 3++/4/5 of the lower extremities with bilateral pelvic rock, musculoskeletally. Neurologically, the claimant had decreased touch of the lower extremities below the knee. (Department Exhibit 9)

The treating physician's clinical impression was that the claimant was temporarily disabled with an expected date to return to work of August 25, 2008 if improved. The claimant was physically limited with limitations expected to last more than 90 days. The claimant could occasionally lift less than 10 pounds, occasionally lift 10 pounds, but never 20 pounds. The claimant could stand and/or walk with normal breaks for a total of less than two hours of an eight hour work day. There were no assistive devices medically needed or required for ambulation. The claimant could use both hands/arms, but neither feet/legs for operating leg controls. The medical findings that support the above physical limitation was decreased strength, muscular tone, proprioception of the lower extremities with decreased range of motion in the back. The claimant had no mental limitations. In addition, the claimant could meet her needs in the home. (Department Exhibit 10)

On [REDACTED], the claimant's treating specialist at [REDACTED] submitted a progress report on the claimant. The claimant's MRI showed mild degenerative changes of C5-C6 and C6-C7 of her cervical spine with mild foraminal stenosis at C5-C6 with no significant central canal stenosis. The claimant's MRI and plain films are consistent with a L5-S1 lytic spondylolisthesis with L4-L5 disk degenerative changes. The claimant has severe foraminal stenosis. (Department Exhibit C)

On [REDACTED], the claimant's treating specialist at [REDACTED] submitted a progress note on the claimant. The claimant had an assessment and plan for acute low back pain with radiculopathy, L5-S1 lytic spondylolisthesis and L4-L5 disk dehydration.

The claimant had C5-C6 and C6-C7 degenerative disk disease with axial neck pain and radiculopathy. The claimant had no focal neurological deficits in her upper and lower extremities except for bilateral L5 and S1 nerve root distribution. The claimant did have decreased pinprick sensation, but strength testing was otherwise intact. The claimant's straight leg raise was negative. Lumbar range of motion was somewhat limited due to pain. The claimant's cervical range of motion was well preserved. The claimant's upper extremity strength and sensation were intact. Reflexes were symmetric. The claimant's MRI films were reviewed where she had a Grade 2 spondylolisthesis of the L5 upon S1 with significant disk height narrowing. The claimant also had modic changes along the endplates of L5 and S1 with severe bilateral foraminal stenosis due to compression spinal listhesis, disk bulge, and ligamentum flavum hypertrophy. Additionally, the claimant had narrowing at L4-L5 disk dehydration without any acute changes. The claimant's cervical spine plain films showed disk space narrowing at C5-C6 and C6-C7 with some spondylosis. (Department Exhibit A)

At Step 2, the objective medical evidence in the record indicates that the claimant has established that she has a severe impairment. The claimant had a fall in November 2007 in a pond where she has been experiencing increased back pain since then. The claimant does have spondylosis in the lower spine with mild foraminal stenosis at C5-C6. She did have decreased sensation in the lower extremities. In addition, she had acute low back pain with radiculopathy. The claimant had no focal neurological deficits in her upper and lower extremities. Her strength testing was otherwise intact and her straight leg raise was negative. Her cervical range of motion was well preserved with reflexes being symmetric. In addition, the claimant had no significant central canal stenosis. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step

2. However, this Administrative Law Judge will proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine disability because Step 2 is a *de minimus* standard.

In the third step of the sequential consideration 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. 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). This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant's impairments do not rise to the level necessary to be listed as disabling by law. Therefore, the claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 3.

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical and psychological findings, that the claimant does have a driver's license and does drive, but has a problem turning and driving long distances. She stated that her legs swell and she has right leg numbness and tingling. The claimant does cook but it takes time. She sits between her cooking where she cooks three times per day. The claimant does not grocery shop. She does clean her own home by washing dishes and folding clothes. The claimant doesn't do any outside work or have any hobbies. The claimant felt that her condition has worsened in the past year because she has had a decrease in sensation with numbness and increase in pain.

The claimant stated that she wakes up between 6:00 to 8:00 a.m. She showers and makes the bed. She has breakfast. She washes the dishes. She takes a walk. She dusts. She reads. She goes to bed between 10:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m. She wakes up at 4:00 a.m. because of insomnia.

The claimant felt that she could walk a half a block. The longest she felt she could stand was 10 minutes. The longest she felt she could sit was 10 minutes. The heaviest weight she felt she could carry and walk was 2-5 pounds. The claimant stated that her level of pain on a scale of 1 to 10 without medication was a 10 that decreases to a 3 with medication.

The claimant stated that she does not currently or ever has drank, smoked or taken illegal or illicit drugs. The claimant stated that there was no work that she felt she could do.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant has established that she cannot perform any of her prior work. The claimant was previously employed as a security guard, which would require her to walk around the premises and check the facilities for intruders and make sure the property was secure. With the claimant's current back issues, she would be unable to protect the premises and uphold the responsibilities of her job if she had to apprehend or if there was an emergency on the premises. The claimant was also employed as a shift crew leader at a fast food restaurant, which would require excessive standing and lifting which with the claimant's current back impairments would be difficult for her to perform. Therefore, the claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 4. However, the Administrative Law Judge will still proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not the claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work.

20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite you limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

...To determine the physical exertion requirements of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very 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).

...To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, you must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. If someone can do light work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary work, unless there are additional limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. 20 CFR 416.967(b).

The claimant has submitted sufficient evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her previous employment or that she is physically unable to do any tasks demanded of her. The claimant's testimony as to her limitation indicates her limitations are exertional.

At Step 5, the claimant cannot meet the physical requirements of light work, based upon her physical abilities. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual, with a high school education, unskilled work history, who is limited to light work, with the claimant's impairments is considered disabled. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, App. 2, Rule 203.28. Using the Medical-Vocational guidelines as a framework for making this decision and after giving full consideration to the claimant's physical impairments, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant cannot perform a wide range of light activities and that the claimant does meet the definition of disabled under the MA program. The claimant is eligible for retroactive MA-P to her application date of July 17, 2008 with a medical review required August 2010 where the claimant is required to provide proof of her surgery, rehabilitation, and steps towards finding other employment.

The department's Program Eligibility Manual provides the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the SDA program.

DISABILITY – SDA

DEPARTMENT POLICY

SDA

To receive SDA, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person, or age 65 or older.

Note: There is no disability requirement for AMP. PEM 261, p. 1.

DISABILITY

A person is disabled for SDA purposes if he:

- . receives other specified disability-related benefits or services, or
- . resides in a qualified Special Living Arrangement facility, or
- . is certified as unable to work due to mental or physical disability for at least 90 days from the onset of the disability.
- . is diagnosed as having Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS).

If the client's circumstances change so that the basis of his/her disability is no longer valid, determine if he/she meets any of the other disability criteria. Do NOT simply initiate case closure. PEM, Item 261, p. 1.

Other Benefits or Services

Persons receiving one of the following benefits or services meet the SDA disability criteria:

- . Retirement, Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI), due to disability or blindness.
- . Supplemental Security Income (SSI), due to disability or blindness.
- . Medicaid (including spend-down) as blind or disabled if the disability/blindness is based on:
 - .. a DE/MRT/SRT determination, or
 - .. a hearing decision, or
 - .. having SSI based on blindness or disability recently terminated (within the past 12 months) for financial reasons.

Medicaid received by former SSI recipients based on policies in PEM 150 under "**SSI TERMINATIONS,**" INCLUDING "**MA While Appealing Disability Termination,**" does not qualify a person as disabled for SDA. Such persons must be certified as disabled or

meet one of the other SDA qualifying criteria. See "**Medical Certification of Disability**" below.

- . Michigan Rehabilitation Services (MRS). A person is receiving services if he has been determined eligible for MRS and has an active MRS case. Do not refer or advise applicants to apply for MRS for the purpose of qualifying for SDA.
- . Special education services from the local intermediate school district. To qualify, the person may be:
 - .. attending school under a special education plan approved by the local Individual Educational Planning Committee (IEPC); **or**
 - .. not attending under an IEPC approved plan but has been certified as a special education student **and** is attending a school program leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent, **and** is under age 26. The program does not have to be designated as "special education" as long as the person has been certified as a special education student. Eligibility on this basis continues until the person completes the high school program or reaches age 26, whichever is earlier.
- . Refugee or asylee who lost eligibility for Social Security Income (SSI) due to exceeding the maximum time limit PEM, Item 261, pp. 1-2.

Because the claimant does meet the definition of disabled under the MA program and because the evidence in the record does establish that the claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does meet the disability criteria for SDA. The claimant is approved for SDA retroactive to her application of July 2008 with a medical review required August 2010 where the claimant is expected to participate in MRS after her doctor approves her after she has had surgery.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department was not acting in compliance with department policy when it denied the claimant's application for MA-P, retroactive MA-P, and SDA. The claimant is not capable of performing work. The department has not established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **REVERSED**. The department is ordered to initiate a review of the claimant's July 17, 2008 application where she is eligible for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance with a medical review required August 2010 where the claimant is required to produce proof of her surgery, rehabilitation, and MRS participation after surgery.

/s/ _____
Carmen G. Fahie
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 9, 2009

Date Mailed: June 9, 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.

CGF/vmc

cc:

