

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 201033970
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
June 16, 2010
Lenewee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain for Marlene Magyar

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 16, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Claimant was represented at the hearing by [REDACTED]

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge Marlene Magyar. Marlene Magyar is no longer affiliated with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System Administrative Hearings for the Department of Human Services and this hearing decision was completed by Administrative Law Judge Landis Y. Lain 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 retroactive Medical Assistance (retro MA-P)?

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 November 23, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 16, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform prior work.

- (3) On February 23, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On May 10, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On May 19, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating that claimant is capable of performing other work in the form of light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b) and unskilled work per 20 CFR 416.968(a) pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.20.
- (6) The hearing was held on June 16, 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 on March 21, 2011.
- (8) On March 31, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its' analysis and recommendation: the objective medical evidence supports the findings of the SHRT. The claimant's impairment's do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light exertional work of a simple and repetitive nature. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of 45 years old, a high school education and a history of light semiskilled employment, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.20 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA was not applied for by the claimant but would have been denied per PEM 261 because the nature and severity of the claimant's impairment's would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days. Listings 4.04 and 9.06 were considered in this determination.
- (9) On the date of hearing claimant was a 45-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'2" tall and weighs 165 pounds. Claimant is a high school graduate and was in special education for English and reading.
- (10) Claimant last worked in 2009 for [REDACTED] as a crew staff. Claimant has also worked as a teacher's helper with the [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] specialty in the mechanical department.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: Addison's disease and hypertension.

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 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 objective medical evidence on the record indicates that an [REDACTED] progress note indicates that claimant came in after hospitalization with essentially cardiovascular collapse. She has been a very difficult patient to figure out and the diagnosis was refined while hospitalized equaling Addison's disease. On current medication, claimant was feeling much better, no longer light headed, had good energy levels and felt very close to her usual and healthy self. Current medication dosing on steroid replacements most probably prednisone cause some side effects, i.e. she was aware of swelling in hands and feet plus face and seemed to be reflected in an unusual weight gain from 108 on the 15th to 126 plus her appetite has been extremely stimulated and she has a great deal of trouble sleeping.

In general appearance, she was alert well oriented and in no acute distress. Lungs were clear. Heart regular sinus rhythm without murmur. Abdomen is soft. Active bowel sounds, non-tender without organomegaly or masses. She is without dramatic overt edema facially or to distal extremities though her wedding rings are somewhat snug. Skin still has somewhat of a bronze look to it. No discomfort, no hesitancy seen, no problems getting up and down off the exam table. Walking out of the room, etc. (exhibit 2, p. 1).

An [REDACTED], medical examination report indicates that claimant was 5'6" tall and weighed 156 pounds. Her blood pressure was 110/74. The clinical impression is that she was stable. She could occasionally lift and carry 20 pounds or less and never carry 25 pounds or more. She could stand or walk less than 2 hours in an 8 hour work day and can sit about 6 hours in an 8 hour work day. She did not require assistive devices for ambulation and she could use her upper extremities for simple grasping, reaching and fine manipulating with neither upper extremity for pushing and pulling. Claimant could not use neither leg nor feet for operating foot and leg controls. Claimant had no mental limitations (exhibit A, pp. 1-2).

A psychiatric medical report in the file dated [REDACTED] [REDACTED] indicates that claimant had a current GAF of 53 and was diagnosed with dementiative Addison's disease, mood disorder due to Addison's disease with depressive features, post traumatic disorder, and learning disorder NOS. Claimant was brought to the appointment by her husband but was seen alone. She was 20 minutes early. She was of average size in appearance and was dressed in a striped top and blue jeans. She had good hygiene. She had prescription glasses. Her leg pain is usually 8 on a scale from 1-10. She was in pain when seen. Her gait and posture were normal. She had fair reality contact with very low self esteem. She was pleasant. She may have minimized the severity of her memory problems, and depressive symptoms. Her speech was clear, logical and fairly spontaneous. She had problems sleeping. She goes to bed at 10:30 and will sleep but wakes up and has trouble getting back to sleep. She denied any suicidal ideation nor hallucination. She was moderately depressed with fair eye contact. She seemed unaware of her errors on the mental status exam. She was oriented to time, person and place. She was able to repeat 4 numbers forward and 3 numbers backward in immediate memory. When she was asked to repeat pencil, plan, and clock 3 minutes later she named 2 out of the 3 correct. She named her date of birth as [REDACTED]

and stated that she would be 45 soon. She named the president as Bush. She gave as cities Adrian, Hudson, Sand Creek, Tecumseh, and Hillsdale. She named people as Vellie Pace (a singer), Sinbad, American Idol, and Reba. She stated that in current news we got's now. She stated that $11-3=7$, $3+4=7$, $4+5=8$, $6+7=12$, $4*5=9$, $6*7=$ she didn't know. In abstract thinking she stated she did not know what the grass is always greener on the other side means and the proverb don't cry over spilled milk means, don't cry over something so stupid. A bush and a tree were alike because they were both green and they were different because the tree grows tall and the bush is flat and fluffy. A car and a bike are similar because they both have wheels and they are different because the bike you pedal and the car has a key. If she found a stamped addressed envelope lying on the ground, she would mail it and if she saw a fire in a theatre she would run (exhibit 2, pp. 7-8).

A [REDACTED] medical examination report indicates that claimant was 5'2" tall and weighed 127 pounds and her blood pressure was 122/82. The claimant is stable (pp. 38-39).

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 memory loss.

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, she 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 younger individual (age 45), with a high school education and a light semiskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.20.

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.

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 and retroactive Medical 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.

Landis

/s/

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

Date Signed: June 23, 2011

Date Mailed: June 23, 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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LYL/alc

cc:

