

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 200930126
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
September 30, 2009
Macomb County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez

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 hearing was held on September 30, 2009.

ISSUE

Was the denial of claimant's application for MA-P, Retro MA-P, and SDA for lack of disability correct?

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 applied for MA-P, Retro MA-P, and SDA on January 30, 2009.
- (2) Claimant is 49 years old.
- (3) Claimant has a high school education.
- (4) Claimant is not currently working.
- (5) Claimant has a prior work history consisting of a car wash supervisor.

- (6) Claimant lost her job as a car wash supervisor because of frequent absences.
- (7) Claimant has a history of depression, hypertension, and asthma.
- (8) Claimant made one suicide attempt in the past and engaged in one instance of self mutilation (cutting of her left wrist) in 2006.
- (9) A cardiac evaluation was completed by a consulting source on [REDACTED].
- (10) Claimant reported episodes of chest discomfort and tingling and numbness in the left arm.
- (11) Claimant was unable to complete a treadmill stress test due to knee pain. Claimant's heart rate was inadequate after 3 minutes.
- (12) Claimant has an ejection fraction of 59-60 percent.
- (13) A form DHS-49-D, Psychiatric/Psychological Examination Report, was completed by claimant's treating source on [REDACTED].
- (14) Claimant was diagnosed with recurrent, severe, major depression with a GAF of 50.
- (15) Claimant reported sleep disturbance and social withdrawal.
- (16) A second treating source completed a DHS-49D on [REDACTED]. Claimant was diagnosed with major depression with a GAF of 50. Claimant had difficulty ambulating; however, claimant had good hygiene, grooming, and eye contact.
- (17) A form DHS-49, Medical Examination Report, was completed by a third treating source on [REDACTED].

- (18) Claimant's functional capacity is extremely limited, and does not retain the capacity to lift and carry, should not stand or walk more than 2 hours in an 8 hour day, should not sit more than 6 hours, retains no capacity for pushing and pulling, reaching, fine manipulation, and simple grasping, is able to operate foot/leg controls with both of her legs, but requires the use of a device for ambulation as needed, and has a deteriorating condition.
- (19) Claimant also has non-physical limitations, such as mental limitations.
- (20) Claimant is limited in her ability to remember, sustain concentration, follow simple directions, and engage in social interaction.
- (21) On [REDACTED], claimant was admitted into [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and placed on hard wrist restraints for 4 hours because of violent, self destructive behavior.
- (22) On [REDACTED], claimant was admitted into [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with symptoms of anhedonia, anxiety, depressed mood, hopelessness, impaired concentration, loss of energy, and feelings of worthlessness.
- (23) Claimant reported suicidal ideation and insomnia.
- (24) Claimant was diagnosed with major depression. Claimant exhibited psychomotor retardation, requiring a cane for ambulation, very flat affect, soft and monotone speech, very limited insight and judgment, and appeared heavily sedated.
- (25) Claimant received a GAF of 30 upon admission.
- (26) Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with a GAF of 45 to 50.

- (27) Claimant takes several medications for her conditions, including Lexapro, Vicodin, Valium, Dyazide, Xopenex, and Elavil.
- (28) On April 14, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied MA-P and SDA, stating that claimant was capable of performing other work under the Medical/Vocational grid rules found at 20 CFR 416.920(f).
- (29) On May 7, 2009, claimant filed for hearing.
- (30) On August 3, 2009, the State Hearing Review Team denied MA-P and SDA, stating that claimant was capable of performing other work and the nature and severity of claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity for 90 days or more.
- (31) SHRT concluded that claimant was capable of performing a wide range of simple, light semi-skilled work, denying claimant's MA-P under vocational rule 202.20.
- (32) On September 30, 2009, a hearing was held before the Administrative Law Judge.

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).

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

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

This is determined by a five step sequential evaluation process where current work activity, the severity and duration of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are considered. These factors are always considered in order according to the five step sequential evaluation, and when a determination can be made at any step as to the claimant’s disability status, no analysis of subsequent steps are necessary. 20 CFR 416.920

The first step that must be considered is whether the claimant is still partaking in Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). 20 CFR 416.920(b). To be considered disabled, a person must be unable to engage in SGA. A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount (net of impairment-related work expenses) is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The amount of monthly earnings considered as SGA depends on

the nature of a person's disability; the Social Security Act specifies a higher SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals and a lower SGA amount for non-blind individuals. Both SGA amounts increase with increases in the national average wage index. The monthly SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals for 2009 is \$1,640. For non-blind individuals, the monthly SGA amount for 2009 is \$980.

In the current case, claimant has testified that she is not working, and the Department has presented no evidence or allegations that claimant is engaging in SGA. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant is not engaging in SGA, and thus passes the first step of the sequential evaluation process.

The second step that must be considered is whether or not the claimant has a severe impairment. A severe impairment is an impairment expected to last 12 months or more (or result in death), which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. The term "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. This is a *de minimus* standard in the disability determination that the court may use only to disregard trifling matters. As a rule, any impairment that can reasonably be expected to significantly impair basic activities is enough to meet this standard.

In the current case, claimant has presented medical evidence of physical and mental health conditions that have rendered her impaired in walking, standing, and social interaction, according to the great weight of the evidence by and claimant’s treating sources. On [REDACTED], a treating source reported that claimant was socially withdrawn. On [REDACTED], claimant was discharged from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with a GAF of 45-50. This indicates that claimant will have significant difficulty interacting with the public, co-workers, and supervisors. Another treating source completed a DHS-49, Medical Examination Report, on [REDACTED]. The treating source noted that claimant retains the capacity to stand and/or walk less than 2 hours in an 8 hour day and requires an assistive device for ambulation. The Administrative Law Judge finds that this is a significant impairment to claimant’s performance of basic physical work activities, and is therefore enough to pass step two of the sequential evaluation process.

In the third step of the sequential evaluation, we must determine if the claimant’s impairment is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This is, generally speaking, an objective standard; either claimant’s impairment is listed in this appendix, or it is not. However, at this step, a ruling against the claimant does not direct a finding of “not disabled”; if the claimant’s impairment does not meet or equal a listing found in Appendix 1, the sequential evaluation process must continue on to step four.

The Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant's medical records do not contain medical evidence of an impairment that meets or equals a listed impairment.

In making this determination, the undersigned has considered listings in Section 4.00 (Cardiovascular System). A listings disability finding for chronic heart disease requires, among other things, either an ejection fraction of 30 percent or less or an enlarged left atrium greater than or equal to 4.5 cm. None of the medical evidence thus far presented to the Administrative Law Judge show that claimant meets either of these requirements. On [REDACTED], claimant underwent a cardiac evaluation, which showed an estimated left ventricular ejection fraction of 59-60 percent. Similarly, a SPECT imaging showed normal left ventricular size and normal wall thickening. Therefore, claimant does not meet the listing for chronic heart failure.

The Administrative Law Judge has also considered listings in Section 12.00 (Mental Disorders). A listings disability finding for affective disorder requires, among other things, at least two of the following: marked restriction of activities of daily living; marked difficulty in maintain social function; marked difficulty in maintaining concentration, persistence, or pace; or repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration.

Claimant's medical records do not contain medical evidence of repeated episodes of decompensation, which requires three episodes within 1 year, or an average of once every 4 months, each lasting for at least 2 weeks. Claimant's medical records only contain documentation of two episodes of decompensation in [REDACTED], a suicide attempt at some point in claimant's past, and one episode of self mutilation in 2006. Similarly, claimant's medical records do not contain medical evidence of marked difficulty in maintaining concentration persistence or pace. Other

than an occasional report or observation of poor concentration, claimant's medical records do not contain any objective medical evidence of marked difficulty in maintaining concentration persistence or pace. Claimant's treating sources did not conduct objective tests, such as subtracting serial sevens or serial threes from 100, or test claimant's memory. Claimant has little to no restrictions in daily activity. Claimant is able to maintain personal hygiene, drive, go grocery shopping, do laundry, wash dishes, and cook. While claimant received a GAF of 45 to 50, which suggests a serious impairment in social, occupational, or school functioning, a finding of marked difficulty in maintaining social function is insufficient by itself to meet the listing for affective disorder.

Therefore, the claimant cannot be found to be disabled at this step, based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d). We must thus proceed to the next steps, and evaluate claimant's vocational factors.

Evaluation under the disability regulations requires careful consideration of whether the claimant can do past relevant work (PRW), which is our step four, and if not, whether they can reasonably be expected to make vocational adjustments to other work, which is our step five. When the individual's residual functional capacity (RFC) precludes meeting the physical and mental demands of PRW, consideration of all facts of the case will lead to a finding that

- 1) the individual has the functional and vocational capacity to for other work, considering the individual's age, education and work experience, and that jobs which the individual could perform exist in significant numbers in the national economy, or
- 2) The extent of work that the claimant can do, functionally and vocationally, is too narrow to sustain a finding of the ability to engage in SGA. SSR 86-8.

Given that the severity of the impairment must be the basis for a finding of disability, steps four and five of the sequential evaluation process must begin with an assessment of the claimant's functional limitations and capacities. After the RFC assessment is made, we must determine whether the individual retains the capacity to perform PRW. Following that, an evaluation of the claimant's age, education and work experience and training will be made to determine if the claimant retains the capacity to participate in SGA.

RFC is an assessment of an individual's ability to do sustained work-related physical and mental activities in a work setting on a regular and continuing basis—meaning 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, or an equivalent work schedule. RFC assessments may only consider functional limitations and restrictions that result from a claimant's medically determinable impairment, including the impact from related symptoms. It is important to note that RFC is not a measure of the least an individual can do despite their limitations, but rather, the most. Furthermore, medical impairments and symptoms, including pain, are not intrinsically exertional or nonexertional; the functional limitations caused by medical impairments and symptoms are placed into the exertional and nonexertional categories. SSR 96-8p, 20 CFR 416.945 (a).

However, our RFC evaluations must necessarily differ between steps four and five. At step four of the evaluation process, RFC must not be expressed initially in terms of the step five exertional categories of "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very heavy" work because the first consideration in step four is whether the claimant can do PRW as they actually performed it. Such exertional categories are useful to determine whether a claimant can perform at her PRW as is normally performed in the national economy, but this is generally not useful for a step four

determination because particular occupations may not require all of the exertional and nonexertional demands necessary to do a full range of work at a given exertional level. SSR 96-8p.

Therefore, at this step, it is important to assess the claimant's RFC on a function-by-function basis, based upon all the relevant evidence of an individual's ability to do work related activities. Only at step 5 can we consider the claimant's exertional category.

An RFC assessment must be based on all relevant evidence in the case record, such as medical history, laboratory findings, the effects of treatments (including limitations or restrictions imposed by the mechanics of treatment), reports of daily activities, lay evidence, recorded observations, medical treating source statements, effects of symptoms (including pain) that are reasonably attributed to the impairment, and evidence from attempts to work. SSR 96-8p.

RFC assessments must also address both the remaining exertional and nonexertional capacities of the claimant. Exertional capacity addresses an individual's limitations and restrictions of physical strength, and the claimant's ability to perform everyday activities such as sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing and pulling; each activity must be considered separately. Nonexertional capacity considers all work-related limitations and restrictions that do not depend on an individual's physical strength, such as the ability to stoop, climb, reach, handle, communicate and understand and remember instructions.

Symptom, such as pain, are neither exertional or nonexertional limitations; however such symptoms can often affect the capacity to perform activities as

contemplated above and thus, can cause exertional or nonexertional limitations. SSR 96-8.

In the current case, it is undisputed that claimant has some physical limitations. On [REDACTED], claimant was admitted into [REDACTED] with complaints of insomnia and suicidal ideation. Claimant's treating source noted that claimant suffers from psychomotor retardation and requires a cane for ambulation. Consistent with this observation, another treating source completed a DHS-49 on [REDACTED]. The treating source reported that claimant requires the use of a cane for ambulation and should not stand and/or walk more than 2 hours in an 8 hour day. Furthermore, a consulting source noted during a cardiac evaluation, completed in [REDACTED], that claimant was unable to complete the treadmill stress test.

While these reports show claimant's exertional capacity, RFC assessments must also address the claimant's remaining nonexertional capacity. Claimant received a GAF of 30 upon admission into [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. After 8 days of treatment, claimant only received a GAF of 45-50 at discharge on [REDACTED]. A GAF between 41-and 50 is generally defined as having a serious impairment in social, occupational, or school functioning. Claimant's treating source noted that, even though claimant had no more suicidal ideations, claimant remained depressed, anxious, and withdrawn. Consistent with this observation, another treating source reported on a DHS-49, Medical Examination Report, dated [REDACTED], that claimant has limitations in social interaction. Claimant also reported that she severed all relationships with family and friends, with the exception of one friend whom she lived with for several years.

From these reports, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant has a disabling impairment when considering the functions of carry and lifting, and standing and walking. Claimant has little to no limitation on sitting. Claimant should avoid climbing, bending, and stooping. Claimant should avoid interacting with the public. Claimant has serious limitations on interacting with others. Claimant may have trouble with timeliness and attendance. Claimant has no visual limitations or communicative (hearing, speaking) limitations.

Claimant's PRW includes a car wash supervisor. This job, as typically performed and as described by the claimant, involves frequent contact with employees and the public. It also requires considerable standing and walking. Therefore, given the functional requirements as stated by claimant (which is consistent with how this job is typically performed) for this job, and claimant's functional limitations as described above, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant does not retain the capacity to perform her past relevant work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the Administrative Law Judge 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 your 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.

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987).

At step five, RFC must be expressed in terms of, or related to, the exertional categories when the adjudicator determines whether there is other work that the individual can do. However, in order for an individual to do a full range of work at a given exertional level, such as sedentary, the individual must be able to perform substantially all of the exertional **and nonexertional functions** required at that level. SSR 96-8p. The individual has the burden of proving that they are disabled and of raising any issue bearing on that determination or decision. SSR 86-8.

If the remaining physical and mental capacities are consistent with meeting the physical and mental demands of a significant number of jobs in the national economy, and the claimant has the vocational capabilities (considering age, education and past work experience) to make an adjustment to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined that the claimant is not disabled. However, if the claimant's physical, mental and vocational capacities do not allow the individual to adjust to work different from that performed in the past, it shall be determined at this step that the claimant is disabled. SSR 86-8.

For the purpose of determining the exertional requirements of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very heavy". These terms have the same meaning as are used in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. In order to evaluate the claimant's skills and to help determine the existence in the national economy of work the claimant is able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semiskilled and skilled. SSR 86-8.

These aspects are tied together through use of the rules established in Appendix 2 to Subpart P of the regulations (*20 CR 404, Appendix 2 to Subpart P, Section 200-204 et. seq*) to make a determination as to disability. They reflect the analysis of the various

vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) in combination with the individual's residual functional capacity (used to determine his or her maximum sustained work capability for sedentary, light, medium, heavy, or very heavy work) in evaluating the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity in other than his or her vocationally relevant past work. Where the findings of fact made with respect to a particular individual's vocational factors and residual functional capacity coincide with all of the criteria of a particular rule, the rule directs a conclusion as to whether the individual is or is not disabled. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(a).

In the application of the rules, the individual's residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience must first be determined. The correct disability decision (i.e., on the issue of ability to engage in substantial gainful activity) is found by then locating the individual's specific vocational profile. Since the rules are predicated on an individual's having an impairment which manifests itself by limitations in meeting the strength requirements of jobs, they may not be fully applicable where the nature of an individual's impairment does not result in such limitations, e.g., certain mental, sensory, or skin impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(c)-200.00(d).

In the evaluation of disability where the individual has solely a nonexertional type of impairment, determination as to whether disability exists shall be based on the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations. The rules do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled for individuals with solely nonexertional types of impairments. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Rule 200.00(e)(1).

However, where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments resulting in both strength limitations and nonexertional limitations, the rules are considered in determining first whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on the strength limitations alone; if not, the rule(s) reflecting the individual's maximum residual strength capabilities, age, education, and work experience provide a framework for consideration of how much the individual's work capability is further diminished in terms of any types of jobs that would be contraindicated by the nonexertional limitations. Furthermore, when there are combinations of nonexertional and exertional limitations which cannot be wholly determined under the rules, full consideration must be given to all of the relevant facts in the case in accordance with the definitions and discussions of each factor in the appropriate sections of the regulations, which will provide insight into the adjudicative weight to be accorded each factor.

Claimant is forty-nine years old, with a high school education and prior work experience performed at the light and medium exertional levels. Claimant's exertional impairments likely render claimant able to perform work at the sedentary level; claimant has no limitations on sitting. While claimant should probably be avoiding exertional activities due to her heart condition, the specific lifting restrictions given by claimant's treating source is not supported fully by the medical record.

That being said, claimant's ability to *perform* work at the sedentary level in no way is a judgment of residual functional capacity. RFC is an assessment of an individual's ability to do **sustained** work-related physical and mental activities in a work setting on a regular and continuing basis—meaning 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, or an equivalent work schedule.

Furthermore, this is only a judgment of exertional limitations. The rules state that exertional limitations must first be considered to determine disability solely on strength factors; if those prove inconclusive, nonexertional limitations must be factored in to determine claimant's true RFC.

Both the MRT and the SHRT evaluated claimant solely on exertional factors; SHRT's evaluation stated that claimant could "do a wide range of simple, light semi-skilled work." While this is potentially true, this determination did not take into account the full range of claimant's limitations, and did not factor in at all claimant's nonexertional limitations, as are required by the rules.

Claimant's nonexertional limitations, discussed above, are supported by the objective medical evidence. Starting with the basic assumption that claimant's exertional limitations limit claimant to either sedentary work, or, viewing things in a light favorable to the Department, light work, claimant's nonexertional limitations stemming from claimant's anhedonia and complaints of insomnia, depression, anxiety, and social withdrawal, render claimant unable to engage in even a full range of sedentary work. Claimant reported that she lost her job as a car wash supervisor due to frequent absences related to her depression. Claimant's doctors agree that she has severe limitations in social interaction, which precludes her from engaging in even a full range of sedentary work, and have filed a DHS-49 indicating that they believe claimant has severe limitations in social interaction. Treating source opinions cannot be discounted unless the Administrative Law Judge provides good reasons for discounting the opinion, and the undersigned does not see a particular reason to discount this opinion. *Rogers; Bowen v Commissioner*, 473 F. 3d 742 (6th Cir. 2007)

Therefore, after careful review of claimant's medical records and the Administrative Law Judge's personal interaction with claimant at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's exertional and non-exertional impairments render claimant unable to engage in a full range of even sedentary work activities on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986). The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that, given claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite claimant's need to avoid interaction with the public and permits frequent absences. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is disabled for the purposes of the MA program.

With regard to the SDA program, a person is considered disabled for the purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in PEM 261. As claimant meets the federal standards for SSI disability, as addressed above, and alleges an onset date of December, 2008, the undersigned concludes that the claimant is disabled for the purposes of the SDA program as well.


DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the claimant is disabled for the purposes of the MA and

SDA program. Therefore, the decision to deny claimant's application for MA-P, Retro MA-P, and SDA were incorrect.

Accordingly, the Department's decision in the above stated matter is, hereby, REVERSED.

The Department is ORDERED to process claimant's MA-P and SDA application and award all benefits that claimant is entitled to receive under the appropriate regulations. The Department is further ORDERED to initiate a review of claimant's disability case in August, 2011.



Robert Chavez
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 08/03/10

Date Mailed: 08/04/10

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.

RJC/dj

cc:

