

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 200932698
Issue No: 2009; 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 24, 2009
Mason County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice Spodarek

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 9/24/10. Claimant was represented at the administrative hearing by [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) application?

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 5/8/09, claimant applied for MA and SDA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS).
2. Claimant applied for 3 months of retro MA.
3. On 6/25/09, the MRT denied.
4. On 7/2/09, the DHS issued notice.
5. On 7/13/09, claimant filed a hearing request.
6. Claimant testified that as of the date of the administrative hearing he had an SSI application pending with the Social Security Administration (SSA) and was waiting for hearing. On 12/29/10 the undersigned Administrative

Law Judge received an SOLQ report indicating that claimant currently has an SSI application pending. The report indicates claimant filed an appeal on 8/18/09. Claimant is listed as having unearned income beginning 5/1/09.

7. On 8/27/09, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant.
8. As of the date of application, claimant was a 38-year-old male standing 5' tall and weighing 150 pounds. Claimant has a 12th grade education.
9. Claimant is an alcoholic. Claimant's medical file is replete with numerous diagnoses of alcoholism, ER visits with ETOH, lab reports repeatedly indicating high levels of AST/SGOT, ALT/SGPT, ALK PHOS. Claimant has no reported drug problems or history. Claimant does not smoke.
10. Claimant does have a driver's license and can drive a motor vehicle.
11. As of the date of the administrative hearing, claimant testified that he is not currently working. Claimant stated that he last worked in 2008 where he was an owner of a land care/landscaping business. Claimant has also worked as a welder for 10 years.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of alcoholism and depression. Claimant added at the administrative hearing that six months prior to the hearing he was diagnosed with neuropathy secondary to alcoholism.
13. The 8/27/09 SHRT findings and conclusions of its decision are adopted and incorporated by reference to the following extent:

History of unskilled work ... medical summary: [REDACTED] excellent strength in all muscle groups. Walked with a wide-based gait and somewhat painful walking. He had a moderate loss of vibratory sensation distally in the lower extremities. Reflexes were trace at the knees and absent at the ankles. He has sensory peripheral polyneuropathy suspected to be related to alcohol. Doctor indicated he would expect him to recover over months if he stayed off alcohol and had adequate diet. Exhibits 13-14.

In [REDACTED] ... diagnosed with depressive disorder and alcohol dependence in early partial remission. Exhibit 18.

Analysis: ... sensory peripheral polyneuropathy which was expected to improve if he stayed off alcohol. He

was able to walk without assistance. Denied per 202.20.

14. Claimant submitted over 200 exhibits of medical documentation. These exhibits are replete with diagnoses and incidences of alcoholism and ETOH in the ER. Claimant has had repeated labs which show high levels of AST/SGOT; ALT/SGPT. Claimant has had numerous radiology reports without showing significant disabling diseases.
15. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that he is able to engage in activities of daily living. Claimant does not need any assistance with his bathroom and grooming needs. Claimant testified that when he shops he uses a wheelchair.

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).

Statutory authority for the SDA program states in part:

- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

In order to receive MA benefits based upon disability or blindness, claimant must be disabled or blind as defined in Title XVI of the Social Security Act (20 CFR 416.901). DHS, being authorized to make such disability determinations, utilizes the SSI definition of disability when making medical decisions on MA applications. MA-P (disability), also known as Medicaid, which is a program designated to help public assistance claimants pay their medical expenses. Michigan administers the federal Medicaid program. In assessing eligibility, Michigan utilizes the federal regulations.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

"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.

The federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

...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.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. 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). If no, the analysis continues to Step 2.
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 416.909(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 that meets the duration requirement? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(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. Sections 200.00-204.00(f)?

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? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do other work. If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to:

...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).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required by claimant to establish statutory disability. The regulations essentially require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate claimant's claims or claimant's physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

...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 sure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

...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).

...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).

Applying the sequential analysis herein, claimant is not ineligible at the first step as claimant is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). MRT denied claimant on the basis of Step 2 finding that claimant's medical evidence lacked duration. This ALJ agrees with MRT to the extent that claimant's neuropathy is not expected to last as it is secondary to the alcoholism. In light of this ambiguity, and the fact that this is a *de minimus* standard at this step, this ALJ will rule the ambiguities in claimant's favor. This ALJ will find that claimant meets both duration and severity. The analysis continues.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meets or equals one of the Listings of Impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Claimant does not. The analysis continues.

The fourth step of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by claimant in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

In this case, this ALJ finds that claimant cannot return to past relevant work on the basis of the medical evidence. The analysis continues.

The fifth and final step of the analysis applies the biographical data of the applicant to the Medical Vocational Grids to determine the residual functional capacity of the applicant to do other work. 20 CFR 416.920(g). After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant does not meet statutory disability on the basis of Medical Vocational Grid Rule 202.20 as a guide. In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that the law classifies claimant as a very young individual. As such, the law would find that claimant could do other work under Medical Vocational Grid Rule 202.20.

As noted above, claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to 20 CFR 416.912(c). Federal and state law is quite specific with regards to the type of evidence sufficient to show statutory disability. 20 CFR 416.913. This authority requires sufficient medical evidence to substantiate and corroborate statutory disability as it is defined under federal and state law. 20 CFR 416.913(b), .913(d), and .913(e); BEM 260. These medical findings must be corroborated by medical tests, labs, and other corroborating medical evidence that substantiates disability. 20 CFR 416.927, .928. Moreover, compliance and symptoms of pain must be corroborated pursuant to 20 CFR 416.929(a), .929(c)(4), and .945(e). Claimant's medical evidence in this case, taken as a whole, simply does not rise to statutory disability by meeting these federal and state requirements. 20 CFR 416.920; BEM 260, 261.

It is noted that claimant testified that he was virtually unaffected with regards to his everyday activities of daily living while, at the same time, claimant testified that he must be in a wheelchair in order to engage in shopping. Claimant's testimony was not supported by the great weight of the medical evidence. To the extent that claimant's ambulation issues are connected to his neuropathy, evidence indicates that his neuropathy should diminish if he stops drinking.

With regards to the alcoholism, statutory disability is not allowed in situations where an individual is an alcoholic or a drug addict if the alcoholism is material to the disability:

The Federal Regulations at 20 CFR 404.1535 speak to the determination of whether Drug Addiction and Alcoholism (DAA) is material to a person's disability and when benefits will or will not be approved. The regulations require the disability analysis be completed prior to a determination of whether a person's drug and alcohol use is material. It is only when a person meets the disability criterion, as set forth in the regulations, that the issue of materiality becomes relevant. In such cases, the regulations require a sixth step to determine the materiality of DAA to a person's disability.

When the record contains evidence of DAA, a determination must be made whether or not the person would continue to be disabled if the individual stopped using drugs or alcohol. The trier of fact must determine what, if any, of the physical or mental limitations would remain if the person were to stop the use of the drugs or alcohol and whether any of these remaining limitations would be disabling.

In this case, disability is not shown. For these reasons, as stated above, the department's actions are upheld.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is UPHELD.

Janice
Administrative

/s/ _____
Spodarek
Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 18, 2011

Date Mailed: January 19, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the mailing date of the rehearing decision.

JS/vc

cc:

