

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

IN THE MATTER:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2010-5579  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 7, 2010  
Macomb County DHS (20)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Linda Steadley Schwarb

**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 hearing was held on April 7, 2010. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. Following the hearing, the record was kept open for the receipt of additional medical evidence. Additional documents were received and reviewed.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS or department) properly determine that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) 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. On February 2, 2009, claimant filed an application for MA-P benefits. Claimant requested MA-P retroactive to November of 2008.
2. On February 26, 2009, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
3. On May 18, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
4. Claimant, age 36, has a high-school education.

5. Claimant reported that he last worked in 2006 as a construction laborer. Claimant reports that he has had no other relevant work experience.
6. Claimant has a history of ulcerative colitis with bowel obstructions and colostomy (most recent reversed in [REDACTED]); a long history of using heroin, crack/cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol and bipolar, depression-anxiety.
7. Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for small bowel obstruction. He underwent a laparotomy and, having been found to have a volvulus, a J-pouch pexy decompression was performed. After removing his own Baker tube for decompression, he was taken back for exploratory laparotomy and creation of end ileostomy.
8. Claimant was hospitalized at [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. His discharge diagnosis was bipolar I depression; rule out substance induced mood disorder; rule out schizoaffective disorder; heroin dependence; marijuana abuse; rule out cocaine abuse; rule out alcohol abuse; and rule out polysubstance abuse.
9. Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for incomplete small bowel obstruction and dehydration.
10. Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for revision of end ileostomy.
11. Claimant sought emergency room treatment on [REDACTED], as a result of chest discomfort secondary to a fall. Claimant reported having been hit playing football approximately one week prior to the ER visit and then, earlier in the day, working in his garage and having fallen on top of a fence pole.
12. Claimant currently suffers from bipolar I disorder; panic disorder with agoraphobia; ulcerative colitis with history of colostomy; and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.
13. Claimant has severe limitations upon his ability to lift extremely heavy objects. Claimant's limitations have lasted twelve months or more.
14. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who, at the very least, has the physical and mental capacity to engage in unskilled light work activities on a regular and continuing basis.

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

Federal regulations require that the department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“Disability” is:

...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.

In general, claimant has the responsibility to prove that he is disabled. Claimant's impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only claimant's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has an impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, claimant is not working. Therefore, claimant may not be disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Secondly, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Basic work activities means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1988). As a result, the department may only screen out claims at this level which are "totally groundless" solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a "*de minimus* hurdle" in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he has significant physical and mental limitations upon his ability to perform basic work activities such as lifting extremely heavy objects and/or the ability to respond to change. Medical evidence has clearly established that claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on claimant's work activities. See Social Security Rulings 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

In the third step of the sequential consideration 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. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant's medical record will not support a finding that claimant's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing past

relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(e). It is the finding of this Administrative Law Judge, based upon the medical evidence and objective, physical and psychological findings, that claimant is not capable of the heavy physical exertion required by his past employment as a construction laborer. Claimant has presented the required medical data and evidence necessary to support a finding that he is not, at this point, capable of performing such work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the claimant's impairment(s) prevents claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite you limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS*, 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987).

This Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis does include the ability to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform simple, unskilled light work. Light work is defined as follows:

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).

There is insufficient objective medical evidence, signs, and symptoms to support a determination that claimant is incapable of performing the physical and mental activities necessary for a wide range of light work activities. In this matter, on [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist diagnosed claimant with bipolar I disorder, most recent episode, unspecified; panic disorder with agoraphobia; and polysubstance dependence. The record noted that claimant had a long history of using heroin, crack/cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating psychiatrist completed a mental residual functional capacity assessment for claimant. Out of twenty categories measuring understanding and memory, sustained


concentration and persistence, social interaction, and adaption, the treating psychiatrist found that claimant had no evidence of limitation or was not significantly limited in thirteen out of the twenty categories. The treating psychiatrist indicated that there were no areas in which claimant demonstrated any marked limitations. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating primary care physician diagnosed claimant with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, ulcerative colitis, and anxiety/mental health issues/bipolar. The physician indicated that, subjectively, per the patient, claimant was capable of occasionally lifting ten pounds as well as capable of standing and walking at least two hours in an eight-hour work day. Claimant was also found to be capable of repetitive activities with the upper and lower extremities. At the hearing, claimant testified that he was currently in a residential mental health/substance abuse treatment program and doing well. Claimant reported that he believed he could lift thirty to forty pounds and that he felt he was capable of light work activities.

There is insufficient objective medical evidence, signs, and symptoms to support a determination that claimant is incapable of performing the physical and mental activities necessary for a wide range of light work. After a review of claimant's hospital records, reports from claimant's treating physicians, and claimant's own testimony, claimant has failed to establish limitations which would compromise his ability to perform a wide range of light work activities on a regular and continuing basis. The record fails to support the position that claimant is incapable of light work.

Considering that claimant, at age 36, is a younger individual, has a high-school education, has an unskilled work history, and has a maximum sustained work capacity for light work, the undersigned finds that claimant's impairments do not prevent him from engaging in other work. As a guide, see 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Table 2, Rule 202.20. Accordingly, the undersigned must find that claimant is not presently disabled for purposes of the MA program. Certainly, claimant must also be found capable of engaging in unskilled sedentary work activities as well.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department of Human Services properly determined that claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance program. Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is hereby affirmed.

  
Linda Steadley Schwarb  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 4, 2010

Date Mailed: August 6, 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.

LSS/pf

cc:

