

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.: 2010-1052
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
November 18, 2009
Oakland County DHS (02)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Linda Steadley Schwarb

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 November 18, 2009. Claimant appeared and testified. Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs?

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 December 4, 2008, claimant applied for MA-P and SDA benefits. Claimant did not request retroactive medical coverage.
- 2) On February 12, 2009, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On February 26, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 39, has a tenth-grade education. Claimant self reports receipt of special education services from grades one through ten.
- 5) Claimant last worked in 1996 as a general laborer performing yard work, painting, and the like. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of unskilled work activities.
- 6) Claimant has a history of crack cocaine and heroin abuse, depression, and attention deficit, hyperactivity disorder.
- 7) Claimant currently suffers from mood disorder, NOS; attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; personality disorder; and mild chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
- 8) Claimant has severe limitations with regard to memory, use of judgment, responding appropriately to others, and dealing with changes. Claimant's limitations have lasted twelve months or more.
- 9) Although claimant is capable of meeting the physical demands associated with employment on a regular and continuing basis, his psychiatric functioning has prevented substantial gainful activity for twelve months or more.

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).

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). In this case, claimant is not working.

Therefore, claimant may not be disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

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.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he has significant mental limitations upon his ability to perform basic work

activities such as understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions; use of judgment; responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers, and usual work situations; and dealing with changes in a routine work setting. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant's work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

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).

Federal regulations at 20 CFR 416.920a (d)(3) provide that, when a person has a severe mental impairment(s), but the impairment(s) does not meet or equal a listing, a residual functional capacity assessment must be done. Residual functional capacity means simply: "What can you still do despite your limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945.

In this case, claimant has a history of crack cocaine and heroin abuse, depression, and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist diagnosed claimant with mood disorder, NOS; attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; and personality disorder. On [REDACTED], claimant was seen by a consulting psychiatrist for the [REDACTED]. The consultant diagnosed claimant with dysthymic disorder; rule out bipolar II disorder, depressed type; polysubstance dependence disorder, alcohol, speeds, cannabis, cocaine, and opioid, in remission, according to self report; learning disorder, NOS, self

reported; intermittent explosive disorder; and antisocial personality disorder. The consultant provided a prognosis of poor. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist diagnosed claimant with bipolar disorder mixed, not psychotic, polysubstance dependence, and antisocial personality disorder. The treating psychiatrist found claimant to be moderately limited in nine areas of understanding and memory, sustained concentration and persistence, social interaction, and adaption. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating family practitioner diagnosed claimant with mild chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and bipolar-depression disorder. The family doctor noted limitations with sustained concentration and social interaction. After careful consideration of the hearing record, the undersigned finds that, although claimant has the physical and intellectual capacity for work, his psychiatric functioning precludes work activities on a regular and continuing basis. Further, the record supports a finding that claimant's limitations have lasted twelve months or more. Accordingly, the undersigned finds that claimant is presently disabled for purposes of the MA program.

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).


A person is considered disabled for purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based upon disability or blindness or the receipt of MA benefits based upon disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in

PEM Item 261. Inasmuch as claimant has been found “disabled” for purposes of MA, he must also be found “disabled” for purposes of SDA benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that claimant meets the definition of medically disabled under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs as of December of 2008.

Accordingly, the department is ordered to initiate a review of the December 4, 2008, application, if it has not already done so, to determine if all other non medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform claimant of its determination in writing. Assuming that claimant is otherwise eligible for program benefits, the department shall review claimant’s continued eligibility for program benefits in May of 2011.


Linda Steadley Schwarb
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 25, 2010

Date Mailed: May 26, 2010

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.

2010-1052/LSS

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.

LSS/pf

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names and contact information of the recipients listed in the 'cc:' field.