

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2010-49993

Issue No: 2009, 4031

[REDACTED]

Ingham 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 October 7, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Claimant was represented at the hearing by L&S Associates.

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] 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 [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 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 March 25, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, State Disability Assistance and Retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On May 27, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform prior work.

- (3) On June 2, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On August 20, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On August 31, 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 203.23 and stating that this may be consistent with past relevant work. However, there is no detailed description of past work to determine this. In lieu of denied benefits as capable of performing past work a denial to other work based on a Vocational Rule will be used.
- (6) The hearing was held on October 7, 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 April 18, 2011.
- (8) On April 27, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: that claimant allege a stroke but was unable to specifically state when she had a stroke. She did have a history of a small hemorrhage in the right thalamus in 2008. The neurological evaluation showed she had a diagnosis of small vessel of ischemic disease likely secondary to sever hypertension. Her blood pressure was elevated but her examination was otherwise unremarkable. A mental status evaluation was also unremarkable. The claimant's impairments 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 at least simple unskilled light work. In lieu of detailed work history the claimant will be returned to other work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile closely approaching advanced age of 51, high school equivalent education and a history of unskilled work MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.13 as a guide. Retro-MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.
- (9) On the date of hearing, claimant is a [REDACTED] woman whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant was 5' 1" tall and weighed 110 pounds. Claimant completed the 11<sup>th</sup> grade and has a GED and also went to clerical school.

- (10) Claimant has not worked in the last 5 years and stated that she did not remember where she worked but also stated that she worked for Xerox and Palo Alto Medical Center sorting mail as a clerk. Claimant also worked as a Certified Nursing Assistant for 5 years and in clerical.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: hypertension, stroke, post CVA, 2008, 2009.

### **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 has not worked in approximately 5 years. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates that claimant lives with her husband and does have a driver's license but does not drive. Claimant testified she does cook but she has to be supervised and she does not grocery shop. Claimant does do some housekeeping duties and she usually needs supervision from her diet and medication. Claimant testified that she feels dizzy, fatigue and has repetitious conversation for her memory. Claimant testified she doesn't know how far she can walk but she does it until she's tired but she doesn't know how long she can stand and she doesn't know how long she can sit. Claimant testified that she is right handed and that she doesn't smoke but she does drink alcohol on holidays and she doesn't take any drugs. Claimant at the hearing alleged that she could not recall her address and she wasn't able to testify to her illness or impairment she didn't know why she was at the hearing and she had odd mannerisms. The witness indicated that claimant was not left alone because she had poor judgment needed help and supervision. A January 18, 2011 psychological evaluation indicates that claimant was oriented to time, place and person. She could recall 5 digits forward and 4 digits backward. She could recall 3 out of 3 objects after a 3 minute time lapse. She knew her birth date and could correctly name numerous recent past presidents. She exhibited average capabilities for general fund information. She could correctly name many large cities, many currently famous people and 2 current events. She completed serial 7's with no mistakes. She exhibited average capabilities for abstract reasoning. She stated the proverb the grass is greener on the other side of the fence meant things looked better for people over there, she stated the proverb don't cry over spilled milk meant don't cry over a little mistake. Joyce indicated that a bush and tree are alike in that they were both plants. She indicated that they were different in size. She exhibited average capabilities for social judgment and comprehension. She stated that if she found a stamped addressed envelope in the street she would mail it. She stated that if she was the first person in a theater to discover a fire she would yell fire. Results of this evaluation indicate that claimant may have suffered a stroke a number of years ago (Exhibit B3). She was diagnosed with dysthymic disorder, cognitive disorder and her current GAF is 65 and she would be able to manage her own funds and her prognosis was guarded (Page B4).

A [REDACTED] clinical center reported dated September 17, 2010, indicates that her height was 61" her weight was 144.5, her temperature was 95.8 degrees Fahrenheit, pulse rate was 68, her respirations were 20, her blood pressure was 160/103, her body mass index was 27.40, body surface area 1.65. Her visual field was full to confrontation, her optic disc appeared normal, extraocular eye movements were intact, she had normal

pain and temperature sensation all three divisions of it trigeminal nerves, bilaterally. She had normal facial muscle strength bilaterally. She had normal auditory acuity intact to bedside testing. Normal pallet elevation. Normal strength of trapezius and SCM muscles bilaterally. Tongue protrudes in the midline no atrophy fasciculations. No atrophy or fasciculations in the muscle bulk. Muscle tone physiologic tone and upper and lower extremities. There was no pronator drift. Strength is graded 5/5 proximally distally in all 4 limbs. No tremor or other involuntary movement is observed. Sensory is intact to touch, pain, joint position and vibration all 4 limbs. Deep tendon reflexes are graded 2/4 symmetrically in all 4 limbs. Coordination rapid alternating movements are performed with normal speed, amplitude and rhythm; finger to nose and heel, knee, shin movements performed accurately and without dismetria. Gait and station arises independently: normal posture: gait stable with normal strides, rate base and arm swings; heel, toe and tandem gait performed without difficulty. Romberg was intact. On physical examination she was well developed well nourished in no acute distress and healthy appearing. Her head was normocephalic and atraumatic. The eyes were intact, fundi were benign, conjunctival sclera were clear. No abdominal bruits, no clubbing cyanosis, edema or deformity noted with normal full range of motion of all joints. She is diagnosed with malignant hypertension and controlled, intracerebral arteriosclerotic dementia (Page A1-A3).

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. 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: post CVA, stroke, and depression.

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 closely approaching advanced age (50), with a high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

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 Retroactive 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, retroactive 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.

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

Date Signed: 6/21/11

Date Mailed: 6/21/11

**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

