

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.: 2010-29604
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
May 17, 2010
Oakland County DHS (04)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen M. Mamelka

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held in Pontiac, Michigan on Monday, May 17, 2010. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED] and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of Medical Assistance ("MA-P") benefit program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Claimant submitted a public assistance application seeking MA-P on December 2, 2009.

2. On December 22, 2010, the Medical Review Team (“MRT”) determined that the Claimant was not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
3. On January 6, 2010, the Department sent an Eligibility Notice to the Claimant informing him that he was found not disabled. (Exhibit 5)
4. On March 17, 2010, the Department received the Claimant’s Request for Hearing protesting the determination that he was not disabled. (Exhibit 6)
5. On April 15, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 7)
6. The Claimant’s alleged physical disabling impairments are due to severe right carpal tunnel syndrome, severe neuropathy, lumbar osteoarthritis, uncontrolled hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid.
7. The Claimant has not alleged any mental disabling impairment(s).
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 52 years old with an [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’11” in height; and weighed 355 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with an employment history as a general laborer.
10. The Claimant’s impairment(s) have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (“MA”) program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services (“DHS”), formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq* and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges

Administrative Manual (“BAM”), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (“BEM”), and the Bridges Reference Manual (“BRM”).

Disability is defined as 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(a) The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913 An individual’s subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a) Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant’s pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicants takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant’s pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3) The applicant’s pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2)

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945 Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1) An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv)

In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a) An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a) The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work;

and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6) An individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, age, education, and work experience, if the individual is working and the work is a substantial, gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i)

In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b) An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c) Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b) Examples 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.

Id. The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be

employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985) An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985)

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to severe right carpal tunnel syndrome, severe neuropathy, lumbar osteoarthritis, uncontrolled hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was admitted to the hospital due to a palpable neck mass. The Claimant underwent an an excision of the parathyroid ademona and near total thyroidectomy. The Claimant's hypertension, uncontrolled type 2 diabetes mellitus complicated by neuropathy, dyslipidemia, morbid obesity, and obstructive sleep apnea were treated/documentated. The CT examination revealed hypodense lesions and degenerative changes of the dorsal spine including bridging osteophytes and inteverterbral disc space narrowing. Marginal facet joint sclerosis was also noted. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of primary hyperparathyroidism due to parathyroid adenoma of the left upper lobe and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid gland, right lower lobe.

On November 20, 2009, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were hyperparathyroid (post surgery), goiter, hyptertension, diabetes mellitus, papillary carcinoma of the thyroid, and chronic lumbar pain. The Claimant's condition at the time of his discharge from the hospital was improving and he was found able to occasionally lift/carry 20 pounds; stand and/or walk about 6 hours during an 8 hour workday; and able to perform repetitive actions with his extremities.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment regarding his thyroid cancer and primary hyperparathyroidism. Radioactive iodine treatment was recommended.

On March 12, 2010, the Claimant's treating physician completed a Short-term Disability Update on behalf of the Claimant. The diagnoses were severe right carpal tunnel syndrome, severe lumbar neuropathy, uncontrolled hypertension, uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ("COPD") and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid. The Claimant need for radiation and hand surgery was documented and the Claimant's condition was noted as "unimproved."

On March 20, 2010, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were severe right carpal tunnel syndrome, severe neuropathy, lumbar osteoarthritis, uncontrolled hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid. The physical examination documented obesity, hoarse voice, thyroid neck scar, high blood pressure, right carpal tunnel syndrome, lumbar nerve neuropathy, and pain in the right hip. The Claimant's condition was deteriorating and was found able to occasionally lift/carry 10 pounds; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours during an 8 hour workday; and was unable to perform repetitive actions with his upper extremities. The Claimant's need for surgery was also noted.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented objective medical evidence establishing that he does have physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. Accordingly, the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant's

basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for twelve months therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis 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. The Claimant asserts physical disabling impairment(s) due to severe right carpal tunnel syndrome, severe neuropathy, lumbar osteoarthritis, uncontrolled hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and papillary carcinoma of the thyroid.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system impairments), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 9.00 (endocrine system), and Listing 13.00 (malignant neoplastic diseases) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence. Ultimately it is found that the Claimant's impairment(s) may meet a listing impairment however the evidence is insufficient to meet the intent and severity requirement thus the Claimant cannot be found disabled or nor disabled under a Listing. Accordingly, the Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a)

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv) An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1) Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3) RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related

symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967 Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a) Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though 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. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.* Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c) An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.* Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d) An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.* Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with

frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e) An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands (exertional requirements, i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a) In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparison of the individual's residual functional capacity with the demands of past relevant work. *Id.* If an individual can no longer do past relevant work the same residual functional capacity assessment along with an individual's age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an individual can adjust to other work which exists in the national economy. *Id.* Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions include difficulty function due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i) – (vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2) The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.*

The Claimant's prior work history includes employment history as a general laborer performing (in part) maintenance/janitorial work, operating machinery, and driving a Hi-lo. In

light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work is classified as unskilled/semi-skilled, medium work.

The Claimant testified that he can walk short distances; has difficulty lifting/carrying more than 10 pounds; is unable to stand for extended periods; has difficulties squatting/bending; and has problems manipulating things with his extremities. The medical evidence restrict the Claimant to occasionally lift/carry 10 pounds; stand and/or walk less than 2 hours; and unable to perform repetitive actions with his upper extremities. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. 20 CFR 416.920 In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is not able to return to past relevant work thus Step 5 is necessary.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity and age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v) At the time of hearing, the Claimant, a high school graduate, was 52 years old thus considered to be closely approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. Disability is found disabled if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the

burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983). In general, age does not seriously affect a younger individual's ability to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.963(c) An individual with a high school education or more are generally found to have the educational abilities to perform semi-skilled through skilled work. 20 CFR 416.963(b)(4)

In the record presented, the total impact caused by the combination of medical problems suffered by the Claimant must be considered. In doing so, it is found that the Claimant is able to meet the demands of sedentary employment as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record and in consideration of the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II], specifically Rule 201.12 and 201.14, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 5.

The State Disability Assistance (“SDA”) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 et seq. and Michigan Administrative Code (“MAC R”) 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and BRM. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (“MA-P”) program, therefore the Claimant's is found disabled for purposes of the SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance program and the State Disability Assistance program.

It is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the December 22, 2009 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his authorized representative of the determination in accordance with policy.
3. The Department shall supplement for lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.
4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in July of 2011 in accordance with department policy.

Colleen M. Mamelka

Colleen M. Mamelka
Administrative Law Judge
For Ishmael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 06/08/2010

Date Mailed: 06/08/2010

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 the Circuit within 30 days of the receipt 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.

CMM/cp

cc:

