

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2010-30757
Issue No: 2009, 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 13, 2010
Livingston County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

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 May 13, 2010. Claimant was represented at the hearing by [REDACTED]

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge [REDACTED] is no longer affiliated with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System Administrative Hearings for the Department of Human Services. This hearing decision was completed by Administrative Law Judge [REDACTED] by considering the entire record.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P), and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 January 16, 2008, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On April 13, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 203.21.
- (3) The department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.

- (4) The claimant's representative filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On April 22, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: There is and Department of Human Services (DHS) Administrative Law Judge decision dated March 17, 2009, that finds the claimant does not have a severe condition. There is a current physical examination purchased which shows no limitations. This case was returned to make a determination related to MA-P and Retroactive MA-P, as well as current State Disability. The evidence in the file has not changed from the decision issued by the DHS ALJ. Therefore, there remains no credible evidence to support any severely limiting condition which would prevent the claimant from remaining gainfully employed. The medical evidence of record does not document a mental/physical impairment that significantly limits the claimant's ability to perform basic work activities. Therefore, MA-P is denied per 20CFR416.921(a). Retro-MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per PEM261 due to lack of severity. Listings 1.20, 1.02, 11.14, 12.04 and 12.09 were considered in this determination.
- (6) The hearing was held on May 13, 2010. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
- (7) Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team.
- (8) On April 13, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommended decision: the objective medical evidence present does not establish a disability at the listing or equivalence level. The collective medical evidence shows that the claimant is capable of medium work. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medial evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of medium work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of claimant approaching advance age, 12th grade education, and medium work history; MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 203.12 as a guide. Retro-MA-P was considered in this case and also denied. SDA is denied per PEM261 because the nature and severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days.
- (9) On the date of hearing claimant was a 51-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 4' 11" tall and weighs 110 pounds. Claimant attended the 10th grade and has a GED.

- (10) Claimant was employed at the [REDACTED] store as a cashier. Claimant has also worked at [REDACTED] as a stocker.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: depression, back pain, arthritis, elevated liver enzymes, upper gastric pain, spinal stenosis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, acute hepatic failure secondary to ETOH plus systemic toxicity.
- (12) Because on this file had so much information and there appeared to be some confusion as to what the Administrative Law Judge was suppose to address, this Administrative Law Judge will address the application from January 15, 2008 to present with a retro months of October and December 2007. This administrative period, this Administrative Law Judge will also address a December 26, 2007 application with retroactive reports to September 2007. All applications herein validated.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

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).

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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, 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 set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are 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).

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
3. Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates physical examination August 2010, reported that claimant was slightly limited in the lumbar spine. She was neurologically intact. She had normal grip, strength and gait. She was a 51 year old female who appeared her stated age. She was 59 ¼" tall and weighed 115.5 lbs. Her temperature was 97.8 degrees and the pulse rate was 72 per minute, respiratory rate was 20 per minute. Blood pressure was 110/68 in the sitting position. She was moderately built and moderately nourished and did not appear acutely ill or in any acute distress. She has an ambulatory with no assistance device. Her skin was within normal limits. The Heent was within normal limits. The head the patient was normocephalic. The color of the face was normal. Visual acuity was 20/30, and the right eye 20/30 and the left for far vision and near vision with reading glasses was 20/20 in both eyes. The neck was within normal limits. The chest and lungs were clear. There was normal sinus rhythm and the heart was normal, no murmurs. The abdomen was soft and flat. Liver, spleen and kidneys were not palpable. There was no tenderness, hernias or audible abdominal bruit. The bowel sounds were normal. (Page A1). In the extremities there was no edema with good pulses. In the musculoskeletal system the examination of the cervical, dorsal, and lumbosacral spines clinically did reveal s-shaped scoliosis. There was tenderness of the right side SI. The motions of the lumbosacral spine were as follows: forward flexion 0-90 degrees, backward extension 0-10 degrees, lateral flexion 0-15 degrees, lateral rotation 0-15 degrees. Examination of the upper and lower extremities did reveal status post bilateral carpal tunnel release.

Bilateral 1st MP 0-75 degrees on the right and 0-85 degrees on the left. A neurological examination was within normal limits. The patient was cooperative and oriented to time, place and person. There was no memory loss. The patient was right-handed. The grip strength was 30 pounds on the right and 40 pounds on the left. The cerebellar functions were tested. The gait was normal; able to walk on toes and heels. The diagnosis was scoliosis and status post bilateral carpal tunnel release. (Page A2). The medical examination report was filed August 26, 2010. The August 26, 2010 examination was the bilateral hands indicates that there were no fractures, dislocations or other bony variations. The soft tissue structures were normal and she had a normal bilateral hands. (Page A3). A January 10, 2008 medical examination indicates that claimant was assessed with a history of substance abuse and generalized arthralgias. (Page 33). She has a significant smoking history of 32 packs per year, she still continues to smoke she was a heavy drinker but allege to quit alcohol as of September 2008. (Page 33). On April 29, 2008 claimant weighed 120 lbs, her blood pressure was 110/76, pulse was 80, and pain was 0 out of 10. She was alert and oriented in no acute distress. All other areas were normal. She had 4/5 strength in her arms. Atrophy on the left brachioradialis and very thick skin on her palms and {IP joints. No atrophy of the thenar eminence. Hips and knees have normal range of motion. Her feet are edematous and without discoloration with good peripheral pulses throughout. (Page 36). A September 25, 2007 admission indicates that claimant had acute hepatic failure secondary to ETOH systemic toxicity. She was still actively drinking. She had thrombocytopenia secondary to alcoholic liver failure. (Page 31).

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of her body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file which support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impression is that claimant is stable. There is no medical finding that claimant has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, claimant has restricted herself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon her reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges the following disabling mental impairments: depression and anxiety

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate

increased mental demands associated with competitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon her failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny her again at Step 4 based upon her ability to perform her past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which she has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 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. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

Light work. 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).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment or that she is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of her. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and she should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Claimant has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that she has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent her from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a person who is closely approaching advanced (age 51), with a 12th grade education and medium work history who is limited to light work or sedentary work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.21.

The Federal Regulations at 20 CFR 404.1535 speak to the determination of whether Drug Addiction and Alcoholism (DAA) is material to a person's disability and when benefits will or will not be approved. The regulations require the disability analysis be completed prior to a determination of whether a person's drug and alcohol use is material. It is only when a person meets the disability criterion, as set forth in the regulations, that the issue of materiality becomes relevant. In such cases, the regulations require a sixth step to determine the materiality of DAA to a person's disability.

When the record contains evidence of DAA, a determination must be made whether or not the person would continue to be disabled if the individual stopped using drugs or

alcohol. The trier of fact must determine what, if any, of the physical or mental limitations would remain if the person were to stop the use of the drugs or alcohol and whether any of these remaining limitations would be disabling.

Claimant's testimony and the information contained in the file indicate that claimant has a history of drug, and alcohol abuse. Applicable hearing is the Drug Abuse and Alcohol (DA&A) Legislation, Public Law 104-121, Section 105(b)(1), 110 STAT. 853, 42 USC 423(d)(2)(C), 1382(c)(a)(3)(J) Supplement Five 1999. The law indicates that individuals are not eligible and/or are not disabled where drug addiction or alcoholism is a contributing factor material to the determination of disability. After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant does not meet the statutory disability definition under the authority of the DA&A Legislation because her substance abuse is material to her alleged impairment and alleged disability.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

The department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with her impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

/s/

Landis Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 12/22/11

Date Mailed: 12/22/11

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.

LYL/ds

■ [REDACTED]