

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.: 2010-2759  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
December 16, 2009  
Macomb County DHS (12)

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 December 16, 2009. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. 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) program?

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 20, 2009, an application was filed on claimant's behalf for MA-P benefits. The application requested MA-P retroactive to April of 2009.

- 2) On June 17, 2009, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On August 14, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 41, has an eleventh-grade education.
- 5) Claimant last worked in 2007 as a chrome plater. Claimant reported that this was his only relevant work.
- 6) Claimant testified at the hearing that he intended to start working within a few days as a marshal arts instructor for four hours a week. He hoped to increase his hours as time went on.
- 7) Claimant has a history of sarcoidosis and hypertension.
- 8) At the time of the hearing, claimant was a recipient of the Adult Medical Program and, thus, had access to doctor visits and prescriptions.
- 9) Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] as a result of difficulty breathing. He underwent heart catheterization. His discharge diagnosis was acute systolic congestive heart failure, non ischemic cardiomyopathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, chronic renal insufficiency, and foot pain.
- 10) Claimant currently suffers from hypertension, mild non ischemic cardiomyopathy, dyslipidemia, and history of mild pulmonary hypertension and renal insufficiency.
- 11) Claimant has severe limitations upon his ability to walk or stand for prolonged periods of time and/or lift extremely heavy objects. Claimant's limitations have lasted or are expected to last twelve months or more.

- 12) Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who has the physical and mental capacity to engage in light work activities on a regular and continuing basis.

#### 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 he 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. 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 (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 he has significant physical limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as walking and standing for prolonged periods of time and 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 and psychological findings, that claimant is not capable of the prolonged walking and standing and/or heavy lifting required by his past employment as a chrome plater. Claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he is not, at this point, capable of performing such work.

In the fifth 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 other work.

20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS*, 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987).

This Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to perform the physical and mental demands required to perform light work. Light work is defined as follows:

Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or

when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

There is insufficient objective medical evidence, signs, and symptoms to support a determination that claimant is incapable of performing the physical and mental activities necessary for a wide range of light work. Claimant was hospitalized in [REDACTED] following complaints of difficulty in breathing. He underwent cardiac catheterization. His discharge diagnosis was acute systolic congestive heart failure, non ischemic cardiomyopathy, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, chronic renal insufficiency, and foot pain. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating cardiologist opined that claimant suffered from moderate non ischemic cardiomyopathy, currently compensated; hypertension, improved control; dyslipidemia, on a statin; mild pulmonary hypertension; renal insufficiency; and normal coronary arteries per angiography performed in [REDACTED]. The cardiologist indicated that claimant had a Class II functional capacity on the New York Heart Classification. [Patients with cardiac disease resulting in slight limitation of physical activity. They are comfortable at rest. Ordinary physical activities result in fatigue, palpitation, dyspnea or anginal pain.] The cardiologist gave claimant a therapeutic classification of Class C. [Patients with cardiac disease whose ordinary physical activities should be moderately restricted and whose more strenuous efforts should be discontinued.] On [REDACTED], the treating cardiologist opined that claimant was capable of frequently lifting ten pounds and occasionally lifting twenty-five pounds. The cardiologist indicated that claimant was capable of standing or walking at least two hours in an eight-hour work day and that, other than pushing and pulling, claimant had no limitations with regard to repetitive activities of the upper and lower extremities. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating cardiologist diagnosed claimant with mild and improved non ischemic cardiomyopathy; hypertension; dyslipidemia; normal coronary arteries angiographically [REDACTED]; history of mild pulmonary hypertension and


renal insufficiency; and lower extremity edema, likely multi-factorial, related to the above, in addition to body habitus, venous insufficiency-no clinical evidence of left heart failure at this time. The consultant indicated that claimant was capable of frequently lifting up to twenty-five pounds and occasionally lifting fifty pounds or more. The consultant indicated that claimant was capable of standing or walking about six hours in an eight-hour work day. He further indicated that claimant had no limitations with regard to repetitive activities of the upper and lower extremities. On [REDACTED] the treating cardiologist gave claimant a functional capacity of Class II on the New York Heart Classification and a therapeutic classification of Class B. [Patients with a cardiac disease whose ordinary physical activities need not be restricted, but should be advised against severe or competitive physical efforts.] After review of claimant's hospital records and reports from claimant's treating specialist, claimant has failed to establish limitations which would compromise his ability to perform a wide range of light work activities on a regular and continuing basis. The record fails to support the position that claimant is incapable of light work.

Considering that claimant, at age 41, is a younger individual, has an eleventh-grade education, has an unskilled work history, and has a sustained work capacity for light work, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's impairments do not prevent him from doing other work. See 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Table 1, Rule 202.17. Accordingly, the undersigned must find that claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA 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 program. 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: April 29, 2010

Date Mailed: May 3, 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:

