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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:	2010-42686
Issue No:	2009; 4031
Case No:	
Load No:	
Hearing Date:	
August 10, 2010	
Saginaw County DHS	

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notic e, a telephone hearing was held on August 10, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

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 March 22, 2010, claimant filed an application for M edical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and St ate Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On May 10, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairments lack duration.
- (3) On May 19, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On June 1, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On July 21, 2010, the State Hearing Revi ew Team again denied claimant's application st ating in its' analy sis and recommendation: the claimant has a disc bulge in the lumbar spine. Straight leg raise cause

pain in the right. He fractured his ankle in Novemb er 2009 and had surgery. In March 2010 the x-ray show ed the fixation was stable and the fracture was healing. T he claimant has a history of substance ab use. A mental status showed his thoughts were logical and spontaneous. The claimant's impairment's do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evi dence of record indic ates that the claimant retains the c apacity to per form a wide range of simple unskilled light work. In lieu of d etailed work history, the claimant will be returned to other work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational pr ofile of closely approaching advanced age, 12th grade education and a history of semi-skilled, MA-P is denied us ing Voca tional Rule 202.14 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per PEM 261 because the nature an d severity of the claimant's impairment's would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days.

- (6) The hearing was held on August 10, 2010. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
- (7) No additional medic al information was s ubmitted and the record was closed on March 3, 2011.
- (8) On the date of hearin g claimant was a 53-y ear-old man whose birth date is claimant is 6' t all and weighs 250 pounds. Claimant is a high school graduate. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
- (9) Claimant last worked at a data bank processing applicat ions for loans. Claimant also worked for and for an and for as a machine operator.
- (10) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: a broken ankle, deg enerative disc disease, depression, subst ance ab use, and dis c bulge, as well as arthritis, a pinc hed nerve in the ne ck, migraines, chest pain, diabetes mellitus and hypertension and asthma.

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 oppor tunity 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 A ssistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Service s (DHS or department) admin isters the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department polic ies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of the C ode 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 substant ial 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 deter mine disability . Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past wor k, 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 experienc e. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impair ments do not signific antly limit physica I or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disab ility does not exist. Age, education and work ex perience will not be c onsidered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings wh ich demonstrate a medical im pairment.... 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 press ure, X-rays);
- Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on it s 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 bas ic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities with out 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 a cceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an indiv idual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

2010-42686/LYL

All of the evidenc e relevant to the claim, including m edical opinions, is rev iewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

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

A statement by a medical s ource finding t hat an individual is "d isabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability e xists 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 <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 1. Does the client perf orm S ubstantial 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 c ontinues to Step 3. 20 CF R 416.920(c).
- 3. Does the impairment appear on a spec ial listing of impairments or are the cli ent's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least eq uivalent in s everity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analys is 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).
- Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to t he 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 subs tantial gainful activity and has n ot worked since 2009. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates that claimant testified that he lives with his mother in a house and his mother supports him. Claimant is single with no children under 18 who live with him and no income. Claimant does receive Food Assistance Program benefits. Claimant does have a dr iver's license but no car and he usually takes his mother to pay bills 1-2 times per month and he usuall y drives about 5 miles. Claimant testified that his mother cooks because he can't stand to do it and his mother and sister grocery shop. Claimant testified that he dusts and does dishes and he watches TV all day and reads as a hobby. Claimant testified that he can stand for 10 minutes, and he uses a cane or cr utches and he can sit for 20 minutes and he can walk 2 blocks. Claimant testified t hat he cannot walk, bend at the waist, tie his shoes or touch his toes but he is able to shower and dress himself. Claimant testified that his knees are fine. Claimant said t hat he is r ight handed a nd that his hands and arms have numbness and his legs and feet have shooting pain. Claim ant testified that the heaviest weight that he c an carry is a gallon of milk and he does not smoke, but he occasionally drinks 1-2 beers and did alc ohol and marijuana as a teenager. Claimant testified that in a typi cal day he brushes hi s teeth, washes his face, showers, watches TV and reads. Claimant test ified that he doesn't lik e kids because they depress him and he do esn't like c rowds and family gatherings. He wants to kill hims elf and he doesn't care if he lives or dies because he c an't do the things he used to be able to do like painting and manicuring the lawn.

The claimant fractured his ankle in November 2009 and underwent an open reduction and internal fixation and syndes mosis in No vember 2009 (p. 145). In February 2009, the claimant was 72" tall and 26 6.5 pounds. Upper extremity reflexes were +1 - +2 and symmetrical. Hoffman's was negative. Left leg was normal. He was wearing a cast on the right foot. Sensation was satisfactory (records from DDS).

In March 2010 the claimant was using his CAM boot and crutches. He was struggling to fully weight bear. X-rays of his right ank le showed stable fixati on and heeling of his syndesmosis and bimalleolar ankle injury. Straight leg raise on the right created pain in the L4 nerve root distribution (p. 144).

An MRI of the lumbar spine dated degenerative changes at L4-L5 and disc bulge wi changes at L5-S1. There was no evidence of focal disc extrusions in the lumbar spine. (p. 110).

A mental s tatus in **the second second** showed the claimant had a history of substance abuse. His thoughts were lo gical and s pontaneous though sometimes vague. He was reluctant to talk about certain things such as suicidal ideation. He seemed to displace some mild paranoia, in particular in regards to his most recent employer. His affect was depressed. Diagnosis included major depressive, anxiety disorder, alcohol and cocain e abuse in remission and personality disorder (records from DDS). At Step 2, claimant has the burden of pr oof 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 restrictive physical or mental impairment. the record that claimant suffers a severely Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of his body; however, there are no corresponding clinic al findings that suppor t the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no labor atory or x-ray findings listed in the file. 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 himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his r eports of pain (sympt oms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of pr oof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insu fficient to establish that claim ant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges the following disabling mental impairments: depression, a nxiety and suicidal ideation.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations ar e assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental di sorders (descriptions of restrict ions of activities of daily living, social functioning; c oncentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerat e increased mental demands associated wit h com petitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/ps ychiatric e vidence in the record indicating claimant s uffers severe mental limitations . There is no ment al residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is in sufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it w ould prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was or iented to time, person and plac e during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questi ons at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiar y record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impair ment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at thi s step based upon his 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 evidenc e of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he 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 him again at Step 4 based upon hi s ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no ev idence upon which this Admin istrative Law Judge c ould base a

finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which he 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 his 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 capac ity is what an individual can do desp ite 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 class ify jobs as sedentary, lig ht, 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 t han 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles lik e docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one whic h 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 wor k 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 categor y 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 objecti ve medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Claimant has failed to pr ovide the necessary objective m edical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of im pairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 mont hs. The claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/ps ychiatric evidence contai ned in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it w ould 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 plac e during the hearing. Claimant's c omplaints of pain, while pr ofound and credi ble, are out of proportion to the objective medical ev idence c ontained in t he 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 establis h that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Clai mant is dis qualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not establis hed by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a clos ely approaching advanced age indi vidual at age 54, with a high school education and a sem i-skilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.14.

The department's Program Elig ibility Manual contains the following policy s tatements and instructions for casework ers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assist ance, a person must be dis abled, caring for a disable d person or age 65 or older. BEM , Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled u nder the MA-P program and becaus e the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable t o work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for Stat e Disability Assistanc e 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 Medi cal As sistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, decides that the depar tment has appropriately establis hed on the record that i t was acting in compliance wit h department policy when it deni ed claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medica I Assistance and Stat e Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department ment has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

<u>/s/</u>

Landis

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

Date Signed: _____April 12, 2011

Date Mailed: April 13, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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

