

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2010-54698
Issue No: 2009, 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
October 27, 2010
Ottawa County DHS (70)

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 October 27, 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 June 7, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and Retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On June 30, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairment's do not meet duration.
- (3) On August 19, 2010, the department case worker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On September 9, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On September 28, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its' analysis and recommendation: there is no definitive evidence reporting COPD or left knee impairment. There is a

possibility of left knee meniscal tear without evidence supporting the allegation. The claimant is positive for hypertension and some associated headaches. The claimant's condition has stabilized to light exertional limitations. There is no evidence of a severe psychiatric condition; no psychiatric conditions alleged. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant's condition is improving or is expected to improve within 12 months from the date of onset or from the date of surgery. The claimant retains the physical residual functional capacity to perform light exertional work; there is no evidence of any psychiatric conditions. The claimant's past work was light and semi-skilled in nature. Therefore, the claimant retains the capacity to perform their past relevant work (store manager/team leader). MA-P is denied per 20 CFR 416.920(e). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SD A was not applied for by claimant.

- (6) The hearing was held on October 27, 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 November 3, 2010.
- (8) On November 8, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its' analysis and recommendation: the claimant was admitted in May 2010, due to congestive heart failure. A cardiac catheterization showed only mild diffuse coronary artery disease, but her ejection fraction was 35%. The claimant's primary care physician indicated that he was treating the claimant for depression and anxiety. Office notes dated June 2010, both show her mood was normal and appropriate. Her activities of daily living indicated some limitations due to weakness and tiredness. 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 denied to do her work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of a younger individual, high school education, and history of semi-skilled work, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.21 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.
- (9) Claimant is a 46-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'6" tall and weighs 162 pounds. Claimant attended one year of college. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills. Claimant is a certified medical assistance.

- (10) Claimant last worked in 2010 doing production work at a temporary agency for one week. Claimant has also worked as a Meijer team leader, as a cashier, and a store manager, and as a Medical Assistance from 2001-2003.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: congestive heart failure (CHF), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), left knee pain, coronary artery disease (CAD), hypertension and migraines.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the 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 2010. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The objective medical evidence on the record indicates that claimant testified on the record that she lives with her husband in a house and she is married with no children under 18. Claimant does not have any income and receives no benefits from the Department of Human Services. Claimant does have a driver's license but does not drive since May 2010. Claimant testified that she does cook 1 time per day and cooks food for herself. Claimant testified that she does not grocery shop, her husband does it for her. Claimant testified that she dusts, does dishes and cleans the toilet. Claimant testified that she likes to bake and she usually watches TV 8-10 hours per day. Claimant testified that she can stand for 30-60 minutes, sit for 30 minutes, walk 5-30 minutes and can bend at the waist. She can shower and dress herself but not squat, tie her shoes, or touch her toes and her back hurts and she has left knee problems. Claimant testified that she needs help putting on her clothes and her level of pain on a scale from 1-10 without medication is a 10 and with medication is a 5-6. Claimant testified that she is right handed and her hands and feet are fine and her left leg and foot give her problems. Claimant testified that the heaviest weight that she can carry is a gallon of milk and she does smoke 5 cigarettes per day and her doctor has told her to quit and she is not in a smoking cessation program but she is trying to quit. Claimant testified that in a typical day she gets up, eats, takes her medication, makes her appointments and does her laundry, dusts, sits and makes dinner and then takes a nap, does errands, takes a walk and then eats. Claimant testified that she has not had sexual relations since May because she is scared because of her heart.

A Medical Review Team determined that claimant's impairment's did not meet duration and she would be limited to light work with a sit/stand option or a stand/walk option for 8 hours per day. A July 23, 2009, [REDACTED] admission indicates that claimant is a 44 year old female who is alert and cooperative. She was in no apparent distress. She is afebrile. Her blood pressure was 173/103, heart rate 92, respirations 15, temperature 98 degrees temporal, pulse oximetry on room air is 98%. Oropharynx, mucous is moist and pink. No exudate or petechia. Tongue and uvula are midline. She handles oral secretions appropriately. The neck was supple. The trachea was midline. No adenopathy. The chest; lungs were clear with equal sounds bilaterally. No rales, rhonchi, or wheezing. The heart was regular. The abdomen on the belly in the right upper quadrant is a superficial scratch, no bleeding. The extremity examination on the dorsum of the left hand in-between the first and second metacarpal, some punctate bite. She also has another in-between the webbed space of the second and third finger and the third one is on the proximal phalanx of the third finger. She has normal range of motion of her hand. Brisk capillary refill. Pulse is +2. No symptoms of infection (p. 7).

A February 26, 2010, record indicates that claimant was normal in all areas of examination and was given oral Vicodin for pain (p.15). A May 5, 2010, echocardiogram indicates mild to moderate left ventricular hypertrophy with mild left ventricular dilation. Systolic function is moderately diminished. His hypokinesia globally. This is most pronounced involved in the septum and apex. Estimated ejection fraction is 30-35%. Mild mitral regurgitation into a mildly dilated atrium. Mild regurgitation. Accurate pulmonary artery pressures could not be obtained (p.42).

This Administrative Law Judge did consider all 160+ pages of medical reports contained in the file in making this determination.

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: anxiety, panic attacks, 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, she 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 younger individual (age 46), with a high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

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

Landis

/s/

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

2010-54698/LYL

Date Signed: December 13, 2010

Date Mailed: December 14, 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/alc

cc:

