

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: 2009-73

Issue No: 2009

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

May 27, 2009

Bay 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, an in-person hearing was requested and scheduled. Claimant failed to appear. Claimant was represented at the administrative hearing by [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA-P) 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 4/5/08 claimant applied for MA-P and SDA with the Michigan DHS.
- (2) Claimant did not apply for retro MA.
- (3) On 9/3/08 the MRT denied.

- (4) On 9/5/08 the DHS issued notice.
- (5) On 12/2/08 claimant's representative filed a hearing request.
- (6) The State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) has denied claimant on the following dates: 10/10/08; 1/20/09; 6/8/09.
- (7) On February 17, 2010 the undersigned Administrative Law Judge was informed that claimant has been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. None of the exceptions apply.
- (8) Claimant failed to appear for the administrative hearing. Claimant's representative requested an in person hearing but was unaware of claimant's whereabouts. Claimant's representative could not testify as to claimant's work history. Claimant was not available at the administrative hearing for testimony and/or cross examination regarding biographical data, including education, nicotine, alcohol, drugs, age, height, weight, as well as activities of daily living.
- (9) Claimant was not available, failed to appear for the hearing and was not available for testimony and/or cross examination regarding his alleged medical conditions and/or symptoms.
- (10) The SHRT decisions are adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

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).

Prior to any substantive review, jurisdiction is paramount. Applicable to the case herein, policy states:

Final SSI Disability Determination

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
 - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**
 - .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. PEM, Item 260, pp. 2-3.

Relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until the determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(i). These regulations further provide: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the agency." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(ii).

In this case, there is apparently no dispute relative to the facts. Claimant's claim was considered by SSA and benefits denied. The determination was final. Claimant is alleging the same impairments. None of the exceptions apply.

For these reasons, under the above-cited policy and federal law, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction to proceed with a substantive review. The department's denial must be upheld.

As noted above, should the SSA change its determination, then the new determination would also be binding on the DHS.

As noted, claimant failed to appear for the administrative hearing was not available for testimony and/or cross examination. Claimant's representative indicated that she had never personally met claimant and could not personally testify. In the alternative, claimant would be ineligible at step 1 as there is no evidence that claimant is not working. Claimant has the burden of proof.

In the alternative, should the sequential analysis be applied, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge would concur with the findings and conclusions of the SHRT decisions in finding claimant not disabled under federal law and state policy.

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.

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

Date Signed: March 2, 2010

Date Mailed: March 3, 2010

