

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2010-54558
Issue No: 2009; 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
November 1, 2010
Ionia 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, a telephone hearing was held on November 1, 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 August 3, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On August 17, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work.
- (3) On August 26, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On August 31, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On September 30, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis of recommended decision: the objective medical evidence presented does not establish a disability at the listing equivalent level. The collective medical evidence shows that the

claimant is capable of performing a wide range of light work. 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 a wide range of light work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of a younger individual, limited education and unskilled work history, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.17 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and was also denied. SDA is denied per PEM 261 because the nature and severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above-stated level for 90 days.

- (6) Claimant is a 49-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'10" tall and weighs 133 pounds. Claimant attended the 8th grade and does not have a GED. Claimant testified that he is learning disabled. Claimant is able to read and write and can add, subtract and multiply.
- (7) Claimant last worked September 2010 as a home health care aide for his brother. Claimant has also worked maintenance and for temporary services.
- (8) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: arthritis, degenerative disc disease, pain in the neck and left hip and back, carpal tunnel syndrome in both hands and stress.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

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 since September 2010. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The objective medical evidence on the record indicates that claimant lives with his brother in a mobile home and is single with no children and does not have any income. Claimant receives Food Assistance Program benefits from the Department of Human Services and he does not have a driver's license and his brother or parents take him where he needs to go. Claimant testified he does cook more than two times per day and cooks things like pork and spaghetti. He does grocery shopping up to two times per month with no help. Claimant does vacuum, wash dishes and do laundry and he watches television from one to one and a half hours per day.

Claimant testified that he can stand for 30 minutes at a time and sit 45 minutes at a time, and he can walk two blocks. Claimant testified he can squat with pain and that he can bend at his waist but not much and that his knees are fine. Claimant testified that he can shower and dress himself and tie his shoes with difficulty but touching his toes. Claimant testified that his level of pain on a scale from 1 to 10 without medication is an 8 to 9 and with medication is a 2 to a 3. Claimant stated that he is right-handed and he has arthritis in his knuckles and that his legs and feet get numb. Claimant testified that if he had his way, he could carry 25 to 30 pounds and does smoke a pack of cigarettes per day and his doctors tell him to quit and he is not in a smoking cessation program. Claimant testified he last smoked marijuana about four years ago. Claimant testified that on a typical day he drinks coffee, showers, feeds the dogs, eats and takes care of his animals.

An August 2, 2010 physical examination report indicates that claimant was a pleasant and cooperative, height and weight proportion and is somewhat athletic 48-year-old in no apparent distress. Vital signs were stable. His skin was warm and dry with good color and turgor. No abnormal pigmentation or rash. Head was normocephalic and atraumatic. Eyes were normal. Ears: external canals have patent nasal mucosa is pink and moist. Posterior pharynx is clear. The neck was symmetrical and supple. No nuchal rigidity. Flexion of the neck cannot reproduce low neck pain. There is no JVD or bruits. Chest has equal rise and fall. Hearts S1 and S2 appear regular rate and rhythm. No rubs, gallops or murmurs. Lungs were clear to auscultation bilaterally. No rales, rhonchi or wheezes. Abdomen was soft and tender. No hepatosplenomegaly. No rebound, guarding. No pulse fatigue pulsatile mass. Extremities moving test forward power, no cyanosis, clubbing or edema. Straight leg raise is positive for hamstring tightness on her left and right at 85 degrees. There is no radicular pain. There is no pain in the sciatic notch. The DTRs are equal and reactive at the patellar and Achilles with no sensory or motor loss in the T12, L1 through L5-S1 nerve root level. Extension of the great toe is well-maintained. There is paraspinal splinting, left greater than right. There is no midline tenderness in the lumbar spine except for the L4-L5 (page 6). A CT of the cervical spine without contrast November 23, 2009 indicates no acute fractures were found in cervical spine. There was irregularity of the anterior arch at C1 which appears to be a chronic finding and similar to what was present on the previous cervical MRI of February 3, 2007. The cervical alignment is normal and no bony encroachments are seen on the cervical spine canal. There is disc narrowing with implant spurring at C3-4 and C4-5 with bulging of discs contours which also appears similar to February 3, 2007. There is degenerative narrowing of the neural foramina bilaterally at these levels. No acute fracture or dislocation seen in the bony cervical spine (page 9). This Administrative Law Judge did consider 124 pages of medical reports contained in the file in making this determination. There is a five-view radiology complete lumbar spine series done on August 2, 2010 and the findings were no evidence of lumbar fracture, degenerative disc change is most prominent at L4-L5. There is no spondylolysis. Alignment is normal on bilateral projections. Bronchial projections shows mild left wear curvature. There is slight retrolisthesis of L3-L4 and L4-L5 with no anterior spondylolisthesis on lateral and lumbosacral lateral views. Moderate L4-L5 disc space narrowing is seen with mild sclerosis and spurring. There are no degenerative changes

at L3-L4 with minimal degenerative change in L5-S1. The other visible disc spaces appear unremarkable. There is no compression, deformity or other sign of fracture. There is no destructive lesion or mass. The paraspinal soft tissues are normal (page 29).

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 his 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 himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his 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 impairment: stress.

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 his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this 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 evidence 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 his ability to perform his 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 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 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 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 provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. 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/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 he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual with limited education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.17.

It should be noted that claimant continues to smoke despite the fact that his doctor has told him to quit. Claimant is not in compliance with his treatment program.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

The department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance 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 Medical Assistance and/or State Disability 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 State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

Landis

./s/

Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 24, 2010

Date Mailed: November 29, 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.

LYL/tg

cc:

