

STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: _____,

Reg. No: 201029893

Issue No: 2009/4031

Hearing Date: June 23, 2010
Jackson County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. 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, an in-person hearing was held on June 23, 2010. Claimant was represented by _____ collecting on behalf of a hospital.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 April 29, 2009, claimant applied for MA-P and SDA with the Michigan DHS.
2. Claimant applied for one month of retro MA.
3. On August 20, 2009, the MRT denied.
4. On January 8, 2010, the DHS issued notice.
5. On April 7, 2010, claimant filed a hearing request.
6. On April 15, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant. Pursuant to claimant's request to hold the record open for the

submission of new and additional medical documentation, on February 25, 2011 SHRT once again denied claimant.

7. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she was denied SSI by SSA and appealed the decision. On June 3, 2011, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge received an SOLQ from the Social Security Administration indicating that claimant received an unfavorable ruling with regards to her SSI application. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she alleging the same medical impairments.
8. As of the date of application, claimant was a 42-year-old female standing 5'5" tall and weighing 140 pounds. Claimant has a high school education. .
9. Claimant does not have an alcohol/drug abuse problem based on self testimony. Claimant testified that she has a history of alcohol abuse. Claimant smokes cigarettes. Claimant has a nicotine addiction.
10. Claimant does not have a driver's license due to DUIs.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant testified that she last worked approximately five years prior to her hearing date. Her work history is light unskilled employment.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of bipolar, depression, anxiety, agoraphobia, short term memory loss, polysubstance abuse, vision issues.
13. The April 6, 2010 and subsequent February 25, 2011 SHRT decisions are adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

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, claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she had an appeal pending with SSA for SSI. The undersigned Administrative Law Judge received verification from the Social Security Administration dated June 3, 2011 indicating that claimant received an unfavorable ruling on her appeal. As claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she is alleging the same medical impairments, and none of

the exceptions apply, there is no jurisdiction for the undersigned Administrative Law Judge to proceed.

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, should the sequential analysis be applied, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge would concur with the findings and conclusions of the SHRT decisions in finding claimant not disabled under federal law and state policy.

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.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is UPHELD.

/s/ _____
Janice G. Spodarek
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 23, 2011

Date Mailed: August 25, 2011

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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.

201029893/jgs

JGS/db

cc:

