

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: 2010-13949
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
February 10, 2010
Kent 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.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA-P) 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 9/14/09, claimant applied for MA-P with the Michigan DHS.
- (2) Claimant applied for three months of retro MA.
- (3) On 10/15/09, the MRT denied.

- (4) On 10/28/09, the DHS issued notice.
- (5) On 11/17/09, claimant filed a hearing request.
- (6) Claimant was denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Claimant testified that she consulted with counsel and was informed absent other evidence she did not have paperwork to show a full disability, and was under the age of 50. Claimant testified that she is alleging the same impairments. Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. None of the exceptions apply.
- (7) On 1/9/10, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant.
- (8) As of the date of application, claimant was a 39-year-old female standing 5' 6" tall and weighing 290 pounds. Claimant's classification under the medical BMI Index is morbidly obese. Claimant testified this is a normal weight for her.
- (9) Claimant does not have an alcohol/drug abuse problem or history. Claimant does not smoke.
- (10) Claimant has a driver's license and can drive an automobile.
- (11) Claimant indicated on Exhibit 33 that she last worked in August 2009. Claimant lists her work history as a front desk associate, front desk manager, cashier. Claimant's work history is semi-skilled.
- (12) Claimant alleges disability on the basis of Multiple Sclerosis (MS).
- (13) The 1/9/2010 SHRT decision is adopted and incorporated by reference.

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.

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.

In the alternative, it is noted that should the sequential analysis be applied, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge concurs with the SHRT findings and conclusions of its 1/9/2010 decision denying claimant’s statutory disability on the basis of Medical Vocational Grid Rule 201.28 as a guide. It is noted that claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she did not have evidence that she was “totally disabled” and thus could not meet the federal Social Security requirements to establish statutory disability.

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.

