

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2010-16756
Issue No: 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
March 30, 2010
Calhoun County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ivona Rairigh

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 March 30, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for 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 November 9, 2009, claimant filed an application for State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability. Claimant did not apply for Medicaid as he has medical insurance.
- (2) On December 7, 2009, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that his physical or mental impairments do not prevent employment of 90 days or more.
- (3) On December 7, 2009, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

- (4) On January 8, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On February 4, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating he was capable of performing light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b) and Vocational Rule 202.21.
- (6) Claimant was to provide additional medical information following the hearing, and record extension was granted in order for him to do so. On August 2, 2010 department advised that the claimant has not provided any additional information, and the record was closed.
- (7) Claimant is a 45 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 6' tall and weighs 225 lbs. Claimant completed high school and college classes in construction, and has a truck driving certificate.
- (8) Claimant states that he last worked in August, 2008 for a trucking company as a diesel mechanic, job that lasted him for 6 months until he was hurt. Claimant has a Worker's Compensation lawsuit against the employer who claims that he was not hurt on the job but at home. Claimant has been a truck driver for various companies since 1995, with longest job being year and a half.
- (9) Claimant lives with his sister and receives food stamps. Claimant's driver's license has been suspended due to child support he owes. Claimant cooks and clean house, and spends 8 hours per day on the computer.
- (10) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments fused left wrist resulting in his left hand not being usable, and depression.
- (11) Claimant had not applied for Social Security disability as of the date of the hearing.

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 (RFT).

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, that being a five-step sequential evaluation process for determining whether an individual is disabled (20 CFR 404.1520(a) and 416.920(a)). The steps are followed in order. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If it is determined that the claimant is or is not disabled at a step of the evaluation process, the evaluation will not go on to the next step.

At Step 1, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that he/she has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, he/she is not disabled regardless of how severe his/her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of his/her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

At Step 2, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p). If the claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he/she is not disabled. If the claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

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). 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).

At Step 3, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, the Administrative Law Judge must first determine the claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(e)). An individual's residual functional capacity is his/her ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from his/her impairments. In making this finding, all of the claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe, must be considered (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, the Administrative Law Judge must determine at step four whether the claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his/her past relevant work (20 CFR 404.1520(f) and 416.920(f)). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. In addition, the work must have lasted long enough for the claimant to learn to do the job and have been SGA (20 CFR 404.1560(b), 404.1565, 416.960(b), and 416.965). If the claimant has the residual functional capacity to do his/her past relevant work, the claimant is not disabled. If the claimant is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth and last step.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant is able to do any other work considering his/her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the claimant is able to do other work, he/she is not disabled. If the claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirements, he/she is disabled.

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).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and testified that he has not worked since year 2008. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

At Step 2, in considering the claimant's symptoms, whether there is an underlying medically determinable physical or mental impairment(s)-i.e., an impairment(s) that can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques-that could reasonably be expected to produce the claimant's pain or other symptoms must be determined. Once an underlying physical or mental impairment(s) has been shown, the Administrative Law Judge must evaluate the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of the claimant's symptoms to determine the extent to which they limit the claimant's ability to do basic work activities. For this purpose, whenever statements about the intensity, persistence, or functionally limiting effects of pain or other symptoms are not substantiated by objective medical evidence, a finding on the credibility of the statements based on a consideration of the entire case record must be made.

The objective medical evidence on the record shows that the claimant is a right hand dominant auto mechanic who was pulling bar at work when he felt a snap in his wrist and experienced immediate pain. He was taken to the emergency room on August 14, 2008. X-rays demonstrated what appears to be an old scaphoid fracture with either incomplete healing or fibrous union with prominent radioscapoid arthritis. Claimant was placed in a Velcro wrist splint and referred for evaluation. Claimant eventually had a left wrist fusion and was seen on November 11, 2008 for post-operative exam and still had some pain and some bleeding. Left wrist had no warmth or erythema, and no real swelling, surgical incision was healing, sutures were in place and there was no drainage.

In December, 2008 claimant still had some tenderness over the dorsum of the wrist which was not terribly surprising. Swelling was down and he was able to make a full fist, and it looked like he was progressing nicely. X-ray demonstrated plate fixation of wrist fusion with no complicating features. In January, 2009 claimant had pain in the joint of the thumb, otherwise the wrist was doing well. In August, 2009 claimant thought he had pulled off his plate from an injury when he was working a ½ inch drill and the drill spun and torqued his hand, and he felt instantaneous pain and a pop in the forearm. Last progress note is of November 2, 2009 where the claimant still complained of pain in the left wrist. Swelling was down, full extension of the fingers was noted, and while the claimant had a little bit of stiffness with flexion he was able to make a full fist after a little stretching.

Claimant provided no updated information about his left wrist. Claimant also testified that he was in a hospital for 17 days in March, 2010, before this hearing took place, due to ulcerative colitis, as he had lot of bleeding and swollen large intestine. Claimant did

not provide any additional medical evidence of this ailment either, even though the record was extended for him to do so. No further analysis is needed.

The department's Bridges 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, page 1. Claimant applied for SDA on November 9, 2009. The medical record he presented ends of November 2, 2009. On this date claimant's doctor states that his left wrist is doing well overall, and there is no indication that the claimant would be prevented from working for 90 days or more, a requirement in order to receive SDA. This is not to say that the claimant indeed did or does not have a medical condition that would cause him to be unemployable for this period of time. Claimant had not provided evidence to support such a conclusion. Therefore, as 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.

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 State Disability Assistance benefits. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED, and it is SO ORDERED.

/s/

Ivona Rairigh
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 30, 2010

Date Mailed: November 30, 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.

2010-16756/IR

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.

IR/tg

cc:

