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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:	2010-55041
Issue No:	2009
Case No:	
Load No:	
Hearing Date:	
November 16, 2010	
Jackson County DHS (49)	

#### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

## HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on November 16, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Claimant was represented at the hearing by

## <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (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 May 17, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and Retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On June 14, 2010, the Medica I Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform other work.
- (3) On June 17, 2010, the department case worker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On September 13, 2010, claim ant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On October 13, 2010, the State Hearing Review T eam again denie d claimant's applic ation stating in its analysis and decision: The impairments are medically managed. The claimant retains the capacity to

perform at least unskilled light work. The claimant retains the residual functional capacity to perform light un skilled work per the provisions of 20 CFR 416.967(b) and 20 CFR 416.968(a), and us ing Vocational Rule 202.17 as a guide. This may be cons istent with past relevant work. However, there is no detailed descrip tion of the past work to determine this. In lieu of deny ing benefits as capable of performing past work and denials of other work based on a vocational rule will be used.

- (6) Claimant is a 48-year-old man w hose birt h date is Claimant is 5'11-1/2" tall and wei ghs 270 pounds. Claimant attended the 10th grade and has no GED. The claima nt is not able to read and write and can count money and add.
- (7) Claimant last worked March 2008 as a general laborer. Claimant has worked as a laborer or janitor all of his life.
- (8) Claimant alleges as disabling im pairments: Coronary artery disease, hypertension, shortness of breath, learning d isability, sleep apnea, asthma, emphysema and depression.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of the C ode of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...the inability to do any substant ial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months.... 20 CFR 416.905

A set order is used to deter mine disability . Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past wor k, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experienc e. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

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

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings wh ich demonstrate a medical im pairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood press ure, X-rays);
- Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on it s signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing bas ic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities with out significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include --

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;

- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and
- (6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other a cceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an indiv idual can do des pite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

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

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

A statement by a medical s ource finding t hat an individual is "d isabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability e xists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 1. Does the client perf orm S ubstantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
- 2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis c ontinues to Step 3. 20 CF R 416.920(c).

- 3. Does the impairment appear on a spec ial listing of impairments or are the cli ent's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least eq uivalent in s everity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analys is continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
- 4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
- 5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to t he guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in subs tantial gainful activity and has not worked since 2008. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

In addition, claimant does receive unemploy ment compensation benef its. In order to receive unemployment compensation benefits under the federal regulations, a person must be monetarily eligible. They must be totally or partially unemployed. They must t have an approvable job separation. Also, they must meet certai n legal requirements which include being physically and mentally able to work, being available for and a weekly c laim for benefits on a timely basis. Th seeking work, and filing is Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has not established that he has a sev ere impairment or combination of impairments which have lasted or will last the durational requirement of 12 months or more or have kept him from working for a per iod of 12 months or more. Claimant did last work 2008. Claim ant does receive unemployment every two weeks. compensation benefits in the amount of \$

The objective medical evidenc e on the rec ord indicat es that claimant is m arried and lives with his wife in a hous e. Claimant has no chil dren under 18 and does receiv e unemployment compensation benefits. Claimant has not received any benefits from the Department of Human Services. Claimant does have a driver 's license and drives one time every two weeks but is afraid to drive becaus e he falls asleep at the whee l. Claimant testified that he does cook eggs and macaroni two times per week and that he grocery shops one time per week and usually rides an Amigo cart. Claimant testified that he does dis hes and laundr y and he cuts the grass by riding a mower. Claimant testified that he washes television two to three hours per day and that he can stand for one hour and s it for three hours at a time. Claimant testifi ed that he can walk one block and can shower and dress himself and bend at the waist but cannot squat, tie his shoes or touch his toes. Claim ant testified that his knees were bad and

his back locks up and hurts. Clai mant testified that he is right-handed and that he has carpal tunnel syndrome which he has had for t he last 10 to 15 years. Claimant testified that he is flat-footed and his feet hurt. Cl aimant testified he can carry 10 pounds and does not smoke, drink or do drugs. Claiman t testified that on a typical day, he gets up and goes to get coffee and plays with the cats and sits around and he does some of his chores. Claimant testified that his wife helps him to read and m akes certain that he takes his pills. This Admi nistrative Law Judge did consi der also the 13 pages of medical reports when consider ing this decision. A M edical Examination Report in the file dated May 21, 2010 indicates the claim ant is obese but was normal in areas of examination. His height was 71.5 inches and he weighed 276 pounds. His blo od pressure was 205/138.

On March 5, 2010 discharge summary i ndicates that claimant was diagnosed wit h unstable angina, status post diagnostic ca rdiac catherization with percutaneous coronary intervention of the proximal right coronary artery, mid right coronary artery and right posterior descending artery with Bari metal stents and angios eal closure. He was diagnosed with known coronary artery disease with history of multi vessel percutaneous coronary interventions. A pres erved left v entricular function. Hypertension under sub optimal control in part due to noncom pliance in socioec onomic iss ues. His dyslipidemia, a remote smoker, Type II dia betes and morbid obesity (Page 195). A March 4, 2010 admis sions summary indicates that claimant is an obes e gentleman in no acute distress. His blood pressure was 195/144, heart rate is 91 beating, 80 times a minute. He was saturating 90% in room air and he weighed 267 pounds. His exam was grossly benign with cranial nerves 2 th rough 12 intact. The neck exam showed no jugular venous distention or thyromegaly. His lungs were clear to auscultation. He had distant heart sounds with a somewhat disp laced PMI with regular heart sounds. No His abdom en was obes e and soft with no murmurs, rubs or gallops are heard. organomegaly or hepatoj uguar reflux. The extremities showed no edema clubbing or cyanosis. He is alert and oriented x3 with nonfocal examination. He has 2+ carotid and plus peripheral pulses with no bruits in the vascular ar ea. The extremities showed no edema and no clubbing or cyanosis. His EKG showed sinus rhythm with evidence of inferior myocardial infarction. Lead 3 has a supple ST elevation which is likely due t o aneurismal changes. He does have supple ST-T wave changes in the lateral leads that are consistent with his ischemia (page 192).

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of pr oof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in 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 clinic al findings that suppor t the reports of symptoms and limitations made by t he claimant. There are no labor atory or x-ray findi ngs listed in t he file. T he clinical impression is that claimant was stable.

Claimant alleges the f ollowing disabling mental impairments: Underlying disability and depression.

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

There is insufficient objective medical/ps ychiatric e vidence in the record indicating claimant s uffers severe mental limitations . There is no ment al residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is in sufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it w ould prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was or iented to time, person and plac e during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questi ons at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiar y record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impair ment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at thi s step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidenc e of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon hi s ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no ev idence upon which this Admin istrative Law Judge c ould base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied a gain at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will constitute to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capac ity is what an individual can do desp ite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we class ify jobs as sedentary, lig ht, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more t han 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles lik e docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one whic h involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

Light work. Light wor k involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this categor y when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objecti ve medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Claimant ha s failed to pr ovide the necessary objective m edical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of im pairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 mont hs. The claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/ps vchiatric 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 plac e during the hearing. Claimant's c omplaints of pain, while pr ofound 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 establis h that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Clai mant is dis gualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not establis hed by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individu al (age 48), with a less than high school education and an unskilled work hi story who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

# DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, decides that the depar tment has appropriately establis hed on the record that i t was acting in compliance wit h department policy when it deni ed claimant's application for Medical Assistance and retroactive M should be able to perform a wide range of impairments. The department has establis hed its c ase 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: December 01, 2010

Date Mailed: December 02, 2010

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not orde r a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LYL/tg

# 2010-55041/LYL

CC:

