

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.: 2010-54464
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 13, 2010
Oakland County DHS (03)

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 hearing was held in Walled Lake, Michigan on December 13, 2010. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED], and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department.

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 April 16, 2010.
2. On June 18, 2010, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") determined that the Claimant was not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
3. On June 23, 2010, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT decision.
4. On July 26, 2010, the Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing.

5. On September 25, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 12)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to shortness of breath, high blood pressure, stomach pain, renal mass, cancer, pancreatitis, and kidney cyst.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairment(s) due to depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 52 years old with an [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’10” in height; and weighed 210 pounds.
9. The Claimant has a limited education and an employment history as a tile setter and restaurant cook.
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)

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 shortness of breath, high blood pressure, stomach pain, renal mass, cancer, pancreatitis, kidney cyst, and depression.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the hospital with complaints of abdominal pain. On [REDACTED], a small bowel study was performed which revealed marked dilation of the small bowel. An ultrasound and CT revealed a renal mass. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of acute pancreatitis, ileus secondary to acute pancreatitis, diabetes mellitus, normocytic normochromic anemia, leukocytosis, and hypertension.

2010-54464/CMM

On [REDACTED], the Claimant was evaluated regarding his renal mass which was discovered during his hospital stay (see above). The mass was highly suspicious for malignancy. The Claimant was also diagnosed with diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and recent episode of acute pancreatitis with ileus.

On [REDACTED], an MRI of the abdomen revealed right lower pole renal mass suspicious for renal cell carcinoma; markedly abnormal appearance of the pancreas with surrounding inflammatory changes; and 11 mm lesion within the right hepatic lobe.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a renal mass consultation. The Claimant was informed of the growth rate of the cancer and the need for a timely treatment plan.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was renal mass. Renal cancer was not ruled out.

An [REDACTED] ultrasound revealed a renal mass.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment for his renal mass. A MRI was ordered. The diagnoses were renal mass, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and pancreatitis.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician wrote a letter confirming the Claimant's symptoms and signs of hematuria and weakness. Further work-up revealed a solid mass on the right kidney which is highly suspicious for cancerous mass. As a result of the diagnosis, the Claimant suffers from depression.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant presented to the cancer center for a consult regarding the 3.4 cm renal mass. The physicians were unable, at this point, to determine whether the mass was malignant or benign.

On [REDACTED], a CT confirmed a solid renal mass and complex cystic mass involving the body and tail of the pancreas.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant attended a follow-up appointment at the urologic oncology clinic. A CT scan confirmed the presence of a solid renal mass and a 13.6 x 9 centimeter complex cystic mass on the tail of the pancreas. The renal mass had increased to 3.8 x 3.4 x 3.3 cm. Partial nephrectomy was scheduled as opposed to radical nephrectomy due to the Claimant's young age and other high-risk factors.

On [REDACTED], a MRI of the abdomen confirmed the renal mass, noting it was probably renal cell carcinoma.

2010-54464/CMM

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnosis was right renal mass.

The Claimant is scheduled for surgery on [REDACTED].

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 medical evidence establishing that he does have some physical and mental limitations on his 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 physical disabling impairments due to shortness of breath, high blood pressure, stomach pain, renal mass, cancer, pancreatitis, kidney cyst, and depression.

Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), Listing 5.00 (digestive system), Listing 6.00 (genitourinary system), Listing 9.00 (endocrine system), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders) were considered in light of the objective medical evidence presented. Ultimately, it is found that the Claimant's impairments do not meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment thus the Claimant can not be found disabled, or not disabled, under these listings.

The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairment due to renal cancer. Listing 13.00 discusses malignant neoplastic diseases. Origins of the malignancy, extent of involvement, duration, frequency, and response to antineoplastic therapy are considered as well as an post-therapeutic residuals. 13.00B1-4 Listing 13.21 defines carcinoma of the kidneys, adrenal glands, or ureters. To meet this listing, the cancer must be:

A. inoperable, unresectable, or recurrent

OR

B. with metastases to or beyond the regional lymph nodes

In this case, the objective findings have revealed the renal mass noting that it is likely cancer. There was no evidence that the mass is inoperable, unresectable, recurrent, or has metastases to or beyond the regional lymph nodes. More importantly, at this point,

it is unknown whether the mass is malignant or benign. Based on the foregoing, the Claimant can not 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 work history includes employment as a cook and tile installer. In light of the Claimant's testimony and in consideration of the Occupational Code, the Claimant's prior work as a cook is classified as unskilled, light work while the tile installation employment is considered semi-skilled, medium/heavy work.

The Claimant testified that he can lift/carry possibly 10 pounds; can walk short distances; can stand for short periods of time; can sit for over 2 hours; and experiences difficulty bending and/or squatting. The objective medical records do not contain restrictions. If the impairment or combination of impairments does not limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. 20 CFR 416.920 In consideration of the Claimant's testimony, medical records, and current limitations, it is found that the Claimant is unable able to return to past relevant employment thus 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 52 years old thus considered to be closely approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. The Claimant has a limited education and is unable to read/write in English. 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). Individuals approaching advanced age (age 50-54) may be significantly limited in vocational adaptability if they are restricted to sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.963(d)

In this case, the evidence reveals that the Claimant suffers from abdominal pain, shortness of breath, high blood pressure, renal mass/cancer, pancreatitis, and depression. In consideration of the foregoing, 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 review of the entire record using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.10, it is found, at this point, that the Claimant is 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 disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the April 16, 2010 application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his authorized representative of the determination in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified.

4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in January 2012 in accordance with department policy.

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

cc:

