

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF: [REDACTED],
Claimant

Reg. No.: 2010-16453
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Load No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
April 1, 2010
Wayne County DHS (82)

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 1, 2010. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by his aunt, [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 September 28, 2009, claimant filed an application for MA-P benefits.
Claimant did not request retroactive medical coverage.

- 2) On November 20, 2009, the department denied claimant's application for benefits based upon the belief that claimant did not meet the requisite disability criteria.
- 3) On December 21, 2009, a hearing request was filed to protest the department's determination.
- 4) Claimant, age 41, has a tenth-grade education.
- 5) Claimant last worked in 1995 as a laborer performing parking lot repair. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of unskilled work activities.
- 6) Claimant has a history of alcohol abuse, hypertension, and seizures (described in Claimant's [REDACTED], neurology office visit as seizures from alcohol withdrawal).
- 7) Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for hypertensive urgency. His discharge diagnosis was hypertensive urgency, headache, hypokalemia or low serum potassium, alcohol abuse, substance abuse, cannabinoid use, and likely chronic cerebral ischemia, discovered by head CT.
- 8) An MRI of the brain performed [REDACTED], revealed multiple discrete T2 hyperintense foci in the cerebral white matter, the appearance and distribution of which in a 41 year old patient are highly worrisome for a demyelinating process.
- 9) Claimant currently suffers from white matter disease of the brain, cause unknown; chronic vascular-type headaches, memory disorder, and hypertension.
- 10) Claimant has severe limitations upon her ability to lift heavy objects and is capable of sitting about six hours in an eight-hour work day. Claimant's limitations have lasted or are expected to last twelve months or more.

- 11) 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 has the physical and mental capacity to engage in simple, unskilled sedentary 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 (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) 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 (6th 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 heavy amounts of weight, and remembering simple instructions. 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 lifting required by his past employment. 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 your 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 unskilled sedentary work. Sedentary work is defined as follows:

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).

Unskilled work is defined as follows:

Unskilled work is work which needs little or no judgment to do simple duties that can be learned on the job in a short period of time... For example, we consider jobs unskilled if the primary work duties are handling, feeding and offbearing (that is, placing or removing materials from machines which are automatic or operated by others), or machine tending, and a person can usually learn to do the job in 30 days and little specific vocational preparation and judgment are needed. 20 CFR 416.968 (a).

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 unskilled sedentary work.


In this case, claimant has a history of alcohol abuse, hypertension, and seizures (which have been identified in Exhibit A, p. 8, as related to alcohol withdrawal). Claimant was hospitalized [REDACTED] for hypertensive urgency. His discharge diagnosis was hypertensive urgency, headache, hypokalemia or low serum potassium, alcohol abuse, substance abuse/cannabinoid use, and likely chronic cerebral ischemia. A CT of the head suggested chronic cerebral ischemia. An MRI of the brain on [REDACTED], documented multiple discrete T2 hyperintense foci in the cerebral white matter which was said to be highly worrisome in a 41 year old patient for a demyelinating process. Claimant was seen for a neurology office visit on [REDACTED]. It was noted that claimant's work-up for multiple sclerosis was "all negative." He was diagnosed with vascular-type headaches, migraine-varient headaches, white matter change possibly from demyelinating disease; and memory impairment. On [REDACTED], claimant's treating vascular neurologist diagnosed claimant with white matter disease, cause

unknown. The physician indicated that claimant's condition was stable. The specialist opined that claimant was capable of occasionally lifting up to ten pounds and capable of sitting about six hours in an eight-hour work day. The physician noted that claimant has a memory disorder, cause unknown, and noted limitations with comprehension, memory, sustained concentration, and social interaction. At the hearing, claimant testified that he lives with his father and performs housework such as sweeping the floor, grocery shopping with others, and microwaving food. Claimant testified that he is capable of doing the laundry. After review of claimant's hospital records, records from claimant's treating specialist and test results, claimant has failed to establish limitations which would compromise his ability to perform simple, unskilled sedentary work activities on a regular and continuing basis. The record fails to support the position that claimant is incapable of such work activities.

Considering that claimant, at age 41, is a younger individual, has a tenth-grade education, has an unskilled work history, and has a work capacity for sedentary work, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's impairments do not prevent him from doing other work. As a guide, see 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Table 1, Rule 201.24. Accordingly, the undersigned must find that claimant is not presently disabled for purposes of the MA program.

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: May 25, 2010

Date Mailed: May 26, 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:

