

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: 2009-4273  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
January 15, 2009  
Kalamazoo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jay W. Sexton

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, in-person hearing was held on January 15, 2009, in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified under oath.

Claimant was represented by [REDACTED].

The department was represented by Dan Ruple (ES).

Claimant requested additional time to submit new medical evidence requested by SHRT. Claimant did not provide the proposed medical evidence by the record close date (February 17, 2009). Claimant waived the timeliness requirement so her new medical evidence could be reviewed by SHRT.

ISSUES

(1) Did claimant establish a severe mental impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, continuously, for 12 months (MA-P) and 90 days (SDA)?

(2) Did claimant establish a severe physical impairment expected to preclude him from substantial gainful work, **continuously**, for 12 months (MA-P) and 90 days (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) Claimant is an MA-P/retro/SDA applicant (August 20, 2008) who was denied by SHRT (November 21, 2008) due to claimant's failure to establish an impairment which meets the department's severity and duration requirements. Claimant requests retro MA for May, June and July 2008. (2) Claimant's vocational factors are: age—53; education—high school diploma; post high school education—none; work experience—medical receptionist with the [REDACTED], office manager for a podiatrist, and plastics factory worker.

(3) Claimant has not performed Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) since 2005 when she was a medical receptionist.

(4) Claimant had the following unable to work complaints:

- (a) Emphysema;
- (b) Fibromyalgia;
- (c) Depression;
- (d) Migraine headaches;
- (e) Chronic back pain;
- (f) 10-pound lifting restriction ordered by her physician;
- (g) Status post left hand injury at work (1996).

(5) SHRT evaluated claimant's medical evidence as follows:

OBJECTIVE MEDICAL EVIDENCE ([REDACTED]):

Claimant was seen in ER in [REDACTED] due to nose pain (page 25). The exam was limited most to the nasal area (page 21).

**ANALYSIS:**

Claimant was seen in [REDACTED] due to nose pain. The exam was limited to the nasal area. There is really no medical information in the last year or more. Additional information is suggested.

SHRT requested a complete physical examination by a licensed physician in narrative format.

\* \* \*

(6) Claimant lives with her husband and performs the following Activities of Daily Living (ADLs): dressing, bathing, cooking, dishwashing, light cleaning, laundry (needs help) and grocery (needs help). Claimant does not use a cane, walker or wheelchair. She uses a shower stool approximately 15 times a month. She does not wear braces on her neck, back, arms or legs. Claimant did not receive inpatient hospital care in 2007 or 2008.

(7) Claimant has a valid drivers' license and drives an automobile approximately once a month. Claimant is computer literate.

(8) The following medical/psychological records are persuasive:

(a) Claimant's medical records are summarized by SHRT in Paragraph #5.

(9) There is no probative psychological evidence in the record to establish an acute (non-exertional) mental condition which prevents claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The claimant's allegation of disability based on depression is not established by the medical records. Also, claimant did not provide a DHS-49D or a DHS-49E to show her mental residual functional capacity.

(10) The probative medical evidence does not establish an acute (exertional) physical impairment expected to prevent claimant from performing all customary work functions for the required period of time. The SHRT requested physical examination to provide the following diagnoses: fibromyalgia, migraines, osteoarthritis. The consultant physician did not report

claimant is totally unable to work. The medical evidence of record does not establish that claimant is totally unable to perform normal work activities.

(11) Claimant recently applied for federal disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. Social Security denied her application; claimant filed a timely appeal.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

### CLAIMANT'S POSITION

Claimant thinks she is entitled to MA-P/SDA based on the impairments listed in Paragraph #4, above.

### DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

The department thinks that claimant's medical records are insufficient to evaluate claimant's disability.

The department requested that claimant obtain a complete physical exam by a licensed physician in narrative format and submitted for SHRT's review.

### LEGAL BASE

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 do 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).

**Claimant has the burden of proof** to show by a preponderance of the medical evidence in the record that her mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes. PEM 260/261. "Disability," as defined by MA-P/SDA standards is a legal term which is individually determined by consideration of all factors in each particular case.

### **STEP #1**

The issue at Step 1 is whether claimant is performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). If claimant is working and is earning substantial income, she is not eligible for MA-P/SDA.

SGA is defined as the performance of significant duties over a reasonable period of time for pay. Claimants who are working, or are otherwise performing Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA), are not disabled regardless of medical condition, age, education or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The vocational evidence of record shows that claimant is not currently performing SGA.

Therefore, claimant meets the Step 1 disability test.

### **STEP #2**

The issue at Step 2 is whether claimant has impairments which meet the SSI definition of severity/duration.

Claimant must establish an impairment which is expected to result in death, has existed for a continuous period of 12 months, and prevents all basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.909.

Also, to qualify for MA-P/SDA, claimant must satisfy both the gainful work and the duration criteria (20 CFR 416.920(a)).

Since the severity/duration requirement is a *de minimus* requirement, claimant meets the Step 2 disability test.

**STEP #3**

The issue at Step 3 is whether claimant meets the Listing of Impairments in the SSI regulations. Claimant does not allege disability based on the Listing.

Therefore, claimant does not meet the Step 3 disability test.

**STEP #4**

The issue at Step 4 is whether claimant is able to do her previous work. Claimant previously worked as a medical receptionist at a Clinic. Claimant testified that she is unable to return to her work at the clinic because it required that she lift boxes weighing up to 25 pounds. Since claimant has a medical restriction on her ability to lift, she is not able to return to her former job as a medical receptionist.

Since claimant is unable to return to her previous work as a medical receptionist, she does meet the Step 4 disability test.

**STEP #5**

The issue at Step 5 is whether claimant has a Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to do other work.

Claimant has the burden of proof to show by the medical/psychological evidence in the record that her combined mental/physical impairments meet the department's definition of disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

First, claimant alleges disability based on a mental disorder (depression). Since there is no probative psychological evidence in the record (mental status evaluation), claimant has not established that she is totally unable to work based on her depression. Also, claimant did not submit a DHS-49D or DHS-49E to establish her mental residual functional capacity.

Second, claimant alleges disability based on fibromyalgia, migraine headaches, osteoporosis and body pain. The recent medical evidence obtained at SHRT's request provides the following diagnoses: fibromyalgia, migraines, osteoporosis. Claimant has lifting limitations. The medical evidence of record does not show that claimant is totally unable to do all work activities.

During the hearing, claimant testified that a major impediment to return to work was chronic pain. Unfortunately, evidence of pain, alone, is insufficient to establish disability for MA-P/SDA purposes.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant's testimony about her pain is profound and credible, but out of proportion to the objective medical evidence as it relates to claimant's ability to work.

In short, the Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that claimant is totally unable to work based on the combination of her depression and her physical impairments. Claimant currently performs many activities of daily living, drives an automobile approximately once a month and has an active social life with her husband. In addition, claimant has many managerial skills because she was employed by a podiatrist as a medical office manager.

Considering the claimant's testimony, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that claimant is able to perform simple unskilled sedentary work (SGA). In this capacity, she is able to work as a ticket taker at a theater, as a parking lot attendant, as a greeter at [REDACTED] and as a

telemarketing representative. She would also be able to work part-time as an office manager at a medical clinic.

The department correctly denied claimant's MA-P/SDA application based on Step 5 of the sequential analysis, as presented above.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant does not meet the MA-P/SDA disability requirements under PEM 260/261.

Accordingly, the department's denial of claimant's MA-P/SDA application is, hereby, AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Jay W. Sexton  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 25, 2009

Date Mailed: March 26, 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 receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

JWS/tg

cc:

