

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████,

Claimant

Reg. No.: 2010-16460

Issue No.: 2009, 4031

Case No.: ██████████

Load No.: ██████████

Hearing Date:

March 1, 2010

Wayne County DHS (15)

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 March 1, 2010. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by ██████████. 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 May 15, 2009, an application was filed on claimant's behalf for MA-P and SDA benefits. The application requested MA-P retroactive to April of 2009.
- 2) On July 27, 2009, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On October 23, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 57, is a high-school graduate with some college.
- 5) Claimant last worked in December of 2008 as an office manager and account representative. Claimant was laid off from her employment.
- 6) Claimant has a history of breast cancer, approximately [REDACTED] years ago with no evidence of recurrence, as well as lymphedema of the left arm, hypothyroidism (on Synthroid), and degenerative joint disease of the bilateral knees with left total knee arthroplasty.
- 7) Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for acute dyspnea bronchospasm with bronchitis hemoptys.
- 8) Claimant currently suffers from left arm lymphedema, hypothyroidism (on medication) and chronic bilateral knee pain secondary to osteoarthritis with history of left knee arthroplasty.
- 9) Claimant is capable of meeting the physical and mental demands associated with her past employment as an office manager and account representative as well as other forms of light work on a regular and continuing basis.
- 10) Claimant has been receiving Unemployment Compensation benefits since she was laid off from her job in [REDACTED] through the date of the hearing.

Claimant acknowledged that, in receiving Unemployment Compensation benefits, she certified that she was “able to, available for, and actively seeking full-time work.”

### 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 general, claimant has the responsibility to prove that she is disabled. Claimant’s impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only claimant’s statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has an

impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

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, at the time of the hearing, claimant was not working. Accordingly, 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 (6<sup>th</sup> 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 she has significant physical limitations upon her ability to perform basic work activities such as lifting extremely heavy objects. 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).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical findings, that claimant is capable of her past work. Claimant was hospitalized in [REDACTED] as a result of bronchitis. The record suggests that she has had no further hospitalization. Claimant was seen by a consulting internist for the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. The consultant diagnosed lymphedema, chronic bilateral knee pain, underactive thyroid, and left arm swelling. The consultant ordered x-rays of the bilateral knees which revealed degenerative changes of the right knee and a left knee prosthesis. The consultant provided the following medical source statement:

“Based on the exam, the examinee would have difficulty with use of her left arm with repetitive lifting, pushing, pulling and reaching. She would also have problems with prolonged standing, stooping, squatting and bending due to her chronic knee pain and she is markedly overweight and obese. She would benefit from a weight reduction program.”


On [REDACTED], claimant's treating internist diagnosed claimant with morbid obesity, breast cancer, and severe osteoarthritis of both knees. At the hearing, claimant acknowledged that she has been receiving Unemployment Compensation benefits since she was laid off from her job in [REDACTED]. Claimant acknowledged that, in receiving Unemployment Compensation benefits, she was certifying that she was “able to, available for, and actively seeking full-time work.” Claimant testified that she is, indeed, actively seeking full-time work in customer services work or phone work (her past work). After careful review of the entire hearing record, the undersigned finds that claimant is capable of past work activities as well as other forms of light work on a regular and continuing basis. Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is hereby affirmed.

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. In this case, there is insufficient medical evidence to support a finding that claimant is incapacitated or unable to work under SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Therefore, the undersigned finds that claimant is not presently disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department of Human Services properly determined that claimant is not “disabled” for purposes of the Medical Assistance and States Disability Assistance programs. Accordingly, the department’s determination in this matter is hereby affirmed.

  
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.

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:

