

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2010-37755
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 30, 2010
DHS County: Wayne (19)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Linda Steadley Schwarb

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, a hearing was held on September 30, 2010. Claimant appeared and testified. Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs?

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 March 1, 2010, claimant filed an application for MA-P and SDA benefits. Claimant did not request retroactive medical coverage.
2. On April 22, 2010, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
3. On May 10, 2010, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
4. Claimant, age 58, has an Associate's Degree in Accounting.

5. Claimant last worked in 2005 as an assistant manager of a retail store. Claimant has also performed relevant work as an accountant, cashier, and collections worker. Claimant's work skills are transferable to other jobs.
6. Claimant has a history of depression and remote history of alcohol abuse.
7. Claimant complains of neuropathy in her bilateral hands and arms, chronic headaches, knee problems, and depression.
8. Claimant currently suffers from hypertension; hyperlipidemia; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; seasonal allergies; gastroesophageal reflux disease; mild obstructive sleep apnea; degenerative disc disease of the cervical spine with chronic radiculopathy of the bilateral upper extremities at C5-C6, C6-C7 and C8-T1; left knee pain with history of three surgeries; and depression-anxiety.
9. Claimant has severe limitations upon her ability to walk and stand for prolonged periods of time and/or lift extremely heavy objects.
10. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning her impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who, at the very least, has the physical and mental capacity to engage in past work activities on a regular and continuing basis. Claimant is also capable of other work activities, using her transferable work skills, at a sedentary work level.

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

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for "disabled" as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

"Disability" is:

...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.

In general, claimant has the responsibility to prove that she is disabled. Claimant's impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only claimant's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has an impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, claimant is not working. Therefore, claimant may not be disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Basic work activities means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that she has significant physical limitations upon her ability to perform basic work activities such as walking and standing for prolonged periods of time and/or lifting extremely heavy objects. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant’s work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

In the third step of the sequential consideration 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. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant’s medical record will not support a finding that claimant’s impairment(s) is a “listed impairment” or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant’s impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical findings, that claimant is capable of her past work as an accountant and/or collections employee. In this case, claimant underwent a sleep study on [REDACTED]. The study resulted in a finding of mild obstructive sleep apnea. An MRI of the cervical spine performed on [REDACTED], documented degenerative disc disease of the cervical spine. EMG testing of the upper extremities on [REDACTED], provided electrodiagnostic evidence of chronic radiculopathy changes at C5-C6, C6-C7, and C8-T1 of the bilateral upper extremities. On [REDACTED], claimant’s primary care physician diagnosed claimant with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, obstructive sleep apnea, gastroesophageal reflux disease, depression, anxiety, seasonal allergies, hyperlipidemia, peripheral neuropathy, left knee pain, and hypertension. The physician found that claimant was capable of simple grasping and fine manipulation with the bilateral upper extremities. The physician indicated that claimant was incapable of reaching or pushing/pulling with the bilateral upper extremities and incapable of operating foot or leg controls with the bilateral lower extremities. At the hearing, claimant testified that she is capable of walking for thirty minutes at a time, standing for ten minutes at a time, and lifting up to ten pounds. Claimant has a valid driver’s license. She reports that she is capable of taking care of her cat such as feeding, changing the litter box, and the like. It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical findings, as well as claimant’s own testimony as to her ability to

function in her home and the community, that claimant is capable of her past work activities. Accordingly, claimant may not be found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program. Further, the record supports a finding that claimant is, in general, capable of performing sedentary work activities on a regular and continuing basis. As a guide, see Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Table 1, Rule 201.25. Accordingly, claimant may not be found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program.


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

A person is considered disabled for purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based upon disability or blindness or the receipt of MA benefits based upon disability or blindness (MA-P) automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in BEM Item 261. In this case, there is insufficient medical evidence to support a finding that claimant is incapacitated or unable to work under SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant is not presently disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department of Human Services properly determined that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance programs.

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


Linda Steadley Schwarz
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 4, 2010

Date Mailed: October 5, 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.

LSS/pf

cc:

