

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-36527  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: October 7, 2010  
Oakland County DHS (02)

**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 telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on Thursday, October 7, 2010. The Claimant appeared and testified. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

During the hearing, the Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The new evidence was received and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On December 10, 2010 the SHRT found the Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") benefit 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. The Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits on December 1, 2009.
2. On January 4, 2010, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)

3. On May 13, 2010, the Department sent an Eligibility Notice to the Claimant informing her that she was found not disabled.
4. On May 13, 2009, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit 2)
5. On June 9, 2010 and December 10, 2010, the SHRT determined that the Claimant was not disabled. (Exhibit 3)
6. The Claimant has not alleged any physical disabling impairment(s).
7. The Claimant's alleged mental impairments are due to bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 47 years old with an [REDACTED] birth date; was 5'5" in height; and weighed 215 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college with an employment history working as an Administrative Assistant and Office Manager.
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)

In addition to the above, when evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 20 CFR 416.920a(a) First, an individual's pertinent symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1) When a medically determinable mental impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual's significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2) Functional limitation(s) is assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2) Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication, and other treatment and the effect on the overall degree of functionality is considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1) In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining an individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(3) The degree of limitation for the first three functional areas is rated by a five point scale: none, mild, moderate, marked, and extreme. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4) A four point scale (none, one or two, three, four or more) is used to rate the degree of limitation in the fourth functional area. *Id.* The last point on each scale represents a degree of limitation that is incompatible with the ability to do any gainful activity. *Id.*

After the degree of functional limitation is determined, the severity of the mental impairment is determined. 20 CFR 416.920a(d) If severe, a determination of whether the impairment meets or is the equivalent of a listed mental disorder is made. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(2) If the severe mental impairment does not meet (or equal) a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(3)

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore is not ineligible for 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 bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence. In support of her claim, some older records from 2008 were submitted. On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended an annual psychiatric assessment. The Claimant was diagnosed with bipolar disorder, recurrent, depressed with psychotic features and alcohol abuse. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 44. A Medical Needs form, dated [REDACTED], was also submitted. The current diagnoses were anxiety and depression. Despite the diagnoses, the Claimant was found able to work both her usual occupation as well as other employment without limitations. On this same date, a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were insomnia, anxiety, and depression. The Claimant was in stable condition with no physical or mental limitations. On [REDACTED], a Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The Claimant was not limited in 5 of the 20 factors; not significantly limited in 9 of the 20 factors; and moderately limited in the remaining 6 factors.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 40 and her medication regime remained unchanged.

On [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] medication reviews were scheduled. The Claimant failed to appear for the appointments.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital via petition after being found too drunk to come voluntarily for detoxification. At admittance, the Claimant's GAF was 25 with the diagnoses of bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence. On [REDACTED], the Claimant was transferred to a crisis residential unit.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's medications were reviewed. The Claimant was improving and was stable with current regime. The GAF was 40.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's medications were reviewed. The Claimant's attention, concentration, impulse control, and judgment were within normal limits. The GAF was 42 and it was suggested that the Claimant take anti-psychotic medication which the Claimant declined. The Claimant's current prescribed treatment was increased.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's medications were reviewed. The Claimant was stable with a GAF of 40. The Claimant's medications were not changed and she was scheduled to return in 8 weeks.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating Psychiatrist wrote a letter on behalf of the Claimant stating that she has been a client since [REDACTED] and receives high intensity case management services 1 – 3x monthly, psychiatric services including medication review 1x every 1 – 3 months, and weekly group therapy to maintain sobriety and prevent a relapse. In [REDACTED], the Claimant self-medicated with alcohol. (see above) The Claimant's symptoms include mania, paranoia, racing thoughts, anxiety, difficulty concentrating, depression, and difficulty adapting/coping with stress. The Psychiatrist opined that the Claimant would be unable to maintain employment for a period exceeding at least one year.

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 some medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical and mental limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that 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 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 has alleged mental disabling impairments due to bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence.

Listing 12.00 encompasses adult mental disorders. The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work, and whether these limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 12.00A The existence of a medically determinable impairment(s) of the required duration must be established through medical evidence consisting of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings, to include psychological test findings. 12.00B The evaluation of disability on the basis of a mental disorder requires sufficient evidence to (1) establish the presence of a medically determinable mental impairment(s), (2) assess the degree of functional limitation the impairment(s) imposes, and (3) project the probable duration of the impairment(s). 12.00D The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work consideration, and whether these limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 12.00A

Listing 12.04 defines affective disorders as being characterized by a disturbance of mood, accompanied by a full or partial manic or depressive syndrome. Generally, affective disorders involve either depression or elation. The required level of severity for these disorders is met when the requirements of both A and B are satisfied, or when the requirements in C are satisfied.

- A. Medically documented persistence, either continuous or intermittent, of one of the following:
  - 1. Depressive syndrome characterized by at least four of the following:
    - a. Anhedonia or pervasive loss of interest in almost all activities; or
    - b. Appetite disturbance with change in weight; or
    - c. Sleep disturbance; or
    - d. Psychomotor agitation or retardation; or
    - e. Decreased energy; or
    - f. Feelings of guilt or worthlessness; or
    - g. Difficulty concentrating or thinking; or
    - h. Thoughts of suicide; or
    - i. Hallucinations, delusions, or paranoid thinking; or
  - 2. Manic syndrome characterized by at least three of the following:
    - a. Hyperactivity; or
    - b. Pressure of speech; or
    - c. Flight of ideas; or

- d. Inflated self-esteem; or
  - e. Decreased need for sleep; or
  - f. Easy distractability; or
  - g. Involvement in activities that have a high probability of painful consequences which are not recognized; or
  - h. Hallucinations, delusions, or paranoid thinking; or
3. Bipolar syndrome with a history of episodic periods manifested by the full symptomatic picture of both manic and depressive syndromes (and currently characterized by either or both syndromes)

AND

- B. Resulting in at least two of the following:
1. Marked restriction on activities of daily living; or
  2. Marked difficulties in maintaining social functioning; or
  3. Marked difficulties in maintaining concentration, persistence, or pace; or
  4. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration;

OR

- C. Medically documented history of chronic affective disorder of at least 2 years' duration that has caused more than a minimal limitation of ability to do basic work activities, with symptoms or signs currently attenuated by medication or psychosocial support, and one of the following:
1. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration; or
  2. A residual disease process that has resulted in such marginal adjustment that even minimal increase in mental demands or change in the environment would be predicted to cause the individual to decompensate; or
  3. Current history of 1 or more years' inability to function outside a highly supportive living arrangement, with an indication of continued need for such an arrangement.

The Claimant alleges mental disabling impairment(s) due to bipolar disorder and alcohol dependence. The objective evidence supports the diagnosis of bipolar disorder. Progress notes indicate that the Claimant's condition was improved with treatment. There were no objective findings that the Claimant was markedly limited in daily and/or



social functioning, (marked) difficulties maintaining persistence, concentration, or pace, or repeated episodes of decompensation. Ultimately, based on the medical evidence, the Claimant's impairment(s) does not meet the intent and severity of a listed impairment thus she cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, under this 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 consists of work as an Administrative Assistant and Office Manager. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work is classified as semi-skilled, light work.

The Claimant testified that she does not have any physical limitations nor does the objective medical evidence impose physical restrictions. With regard to the Claimant's mental impairments, there was no evidence of severe functional limitations that would interfere with the Claimant's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. Further, there was no evidence of functional limitations in the Claimant's activities of daily living, social functioning, concentration, persistence, or pace, and/or episodes of decompensation. The objective medical records establish the Claimant has a past history of alcohol abuse/dependence. In consideration of the Claimant's November 2009 hospitalization, it is found that the alcohol use is a contributing factor material to the determination of disability and any of the functional limitations would be limited independent of the abuse. 20 CFR 416.935 Despite this, it is found that due to the mental impairment(s), the Claimant may not be able to perform past relevant work. Accordingly, step 5 of the sequential analysis is required.

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 was 47 years old thus considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. The Claimant has a high school education with some college. Disability is found 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). Where an individual has an impairment or combination of impairments that results in both strength limitations and non-exertional limitations, the rules in Subpart P are considered in determining whether a finding of disabled may be possible based on the strength limitations alone, and if not, the rule(s) reflecting the individual's maximum residual strength capabilities, age, education, and work experience, provide the framework for consideration of how much an individual's work capability is further diminished in terms of any type of jobs that would contradict the nonexertional limitations. Full consideration must be given to all relevant facts of a case in accordance with the definitions of each factor to provide adjudicative weight for each factor.

In this case, the evidence reveals that the Claimant suffers from bipolar disorder. With the exception of the [REDACTED] hospitalization, there was no evidence of functional limitations that would interfere with the Claimant's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively, and on a sustained basis. Further, there was no evidence of functional limitations in the Claimant's activities of daily living, social functioning, concentration, persistence, or pace, and/or episodes of decompensation. The Claimant's treating Psychiatrist wrote a letter stating that the Claimant was unable to engage in employment for a period exceeding one year however other records from treating sources document the contrary. From [REDACTED] forward, the objective evidence shows that the Claimant sporadically participated in therapy and from the [REDACTED] hospitalization (as a result of the Claimant's intoxication), the records reveal that the Claimant attended medication reviews almost monthly. The evidence shows that the Claimant was not significantly limited in her understanding and memory; and was not significantly limited to moderately limited in her ability for sustained concentration and persistence, social interaction, and adaption. The Claimant was not found markedly limited in any area. Ultimately, after review of the entire record, it is found that the Claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to meet at least the physical and mental demands required to perform sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After

2010-36527/CMM

review of the entire record finding no contradiction in the Claimant's nonexertional limitations, and using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.22, it is found that the Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance benefit program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is AFFIRMED.

*Colleen M. Mamelka*

---

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

Date Signed: 12/15/2010

Date Mailed: 12/15/2010

**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.

CMM/jlg

2010-36527/CMM

cc:

