

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: 2010-28100  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
April 29, 2010  
Kent County DHS

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 April 29, 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 December 3, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 16, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairments lack duration.

(3) On February 22, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

(4) On March 11, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

(5) On April 2, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: the claimant has a history of right hip pain due to severe osteoarthritis of the right hip with hip a slipped capital femoral epiphysis. He was scheduled for a hip replacement several times and it was cancelled due to chronic urinary track infections. He was using a cane prior to his hip replacement surgery in February 2010. Prior to his surgery the claimant would have been limited to sedentary work and would have been denied using Vocational Rule 201.27. The claimant is unable to work as of February 2010, when he had his hip replacement, however, he would not be limited from all types of work for 12 months in a row. 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. Therefore, MA-P is denied due to lack of duration under 20 CFR 416.909. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.

(6) The hearing was held on April 29, 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 June 7, 2010.

(8) On June 11, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: that claimant's impairments lack duration per 20 CFR 416.909 and that claimant is capable of performing work in the form of light work

per 20 CFR 416.967(b) pursuant to Vocational Rule 202.22. The State Hearing Review Team commented that this may be consistent with past relevant work. However, there is no detailed description of past relevant work to determine this. In lieu of denying benefits is capable of performing past work in the denial to other work based on a Vocational Ruling will be used.

(9) Claimant is a 40-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED] Claimant is 6' 3" tall and weighs 250 pounds. Claimant is a high school graduate and is able to read and write and does have basic math skills. Claimant also has 2 years of college.

(10) Claimant last worked 2 ½ years ago as a [REDACTED] supervisor driving a hi-lo. Claimant worked as a mentor for at risk youth, as a building manager, and as a resident advisor for juveniles in the [REDACTED]

(11) Claimant was receiving \$ [REDACTED] in State Disability Assistance benefits on the date of hearing as well as Food Assistance Program benefits.

(12) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: osteoarthritis, chronic urinary track infections, femoral epiphysis, reconstructive surgery of the left knee, right hip replacement and no mental impairments.

### 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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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).

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 for approximately 2 years. 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 he microwaves or his mom cooks. Claimant testified that his sister or his friend grocery shops for him and he only cleans his personal space. Claimant testified that he watches TV for about 2 hours a day and that he can stand for a half hour, sit for a half hour, and walks with crutches. Claimant testified that he can walk about 20 yards but he cannot squat. Claimant testified that he can bend at the waist, shower and dress himself and tie his shoes, but not touch his toes. Claimant testified that his level of pain on a scale from 1-10 with medication is a 5-4 and without medication is a 6-7. Claimant testified that his hands and arms are fine and that he is right handed and the heaviest weight he can carry is 10 pounds.

A [REDACTED] exam from May 12, 2010, indicates that on the physical examination the claimant was cooperative in answering questions and following commands. The claimant's immediate, recent and remote memory is intact with normal concentration. The claimant's insight and judgment are both appropriate, the claimant provides a good effort during the examination. Blood pressure in the left arm was 132/78. The pulse was 82 and regular. Respiratory rate is 12, weight is 250, height is 74" without shoes, the skin was normal. Eyes and ears: visual acuity in the right eye equals 20/25 and in the left eye equals 20/30 without

corrective lenses. Pupils are equal, round and reactive to light. The claimant can hear conversation speech without limitation or aids. The neck was supple without masses. Breath sounds were clear to auscultation and symmetrical. There is no accessory muscle use. In the heart there was regular rate and rhythm without enlargement. There was a normal S1 and S2. In the abdomen there was no organomegaly or masses. Bowel sounds are normal. In the vascular area, there is no clubbing, cyanosis or edema detected. The peripheral pulses are intact. In the musculoskeletal area, there is no evidence of joint laxity, crepitation or effusion. Grip strength remains intact. Dexterity is unimpaired. The claimant could pick up a coin, button clothing and open a door. The claimant had mild difficulty getting on and off the examination table, was unable to heel and toe walk, severe difficulty performing a partial squat and was unable to hop. There was no paravertebral muscle spasm noted. Straight leg raising is negative. Range of motion studies were all normal. In the neurological area, cranial nerves were intact. Motor strength is reduced to 4/5 power in the right hip. Tone is normal. Sensory is intact to light touch and pinprick. Romberg testing is negative. The claimant walked with a moderate right limp without the use of an assistive device. Extremity reflexes were 1+ in the right knee ankle, 0 in the left knee and 2+ in the left ankle. The conclusions were that the claimant did have findings of atrophy of the right leg due to lack of activity and diminished range of motion due to lack of therapy. At this point he would benefit from range of motion exercises and strengthening. His long term prognosis would be good with appropriate management. Left untreated his long term prognosis is poor. He does require the use of a cane at this point for balance control as he is still not able to fully weight bare on his right leg.

A March 8, 2010, [REDACTED] indicates that claimant had good internal and external rotation of the right hip. The incision was healing well. He does have mild

edema surrounding the incision. There is no distal extremity edema. Neurovascularly he was intact to bilateral lower extremities. He was using a walker for ambulation and ambulated tenderly. There appeared to be good stability and x-rays were performed and showed good position of the hip components without any evidence of looseness or malpositioning. There does not appear to be any subsidence of the femoral stem. (p. 33)

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he 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 clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. The clinical impression 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, the claimant has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his 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 no mental impairments.

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 mental limitations resulting from his reportedly depressed state. There is no Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment in the record. 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 his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this 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 evidence 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 his ability to perform past relevant work. There is insufficient objective medical evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would again be denied 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 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 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).

**Medium work.** Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective 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 has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. 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/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. Claimant did testify that he does receive relief from his pain medication. 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 he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 40), with a high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

The department's Program 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. PEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because 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 either.

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 and State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Landis Y. Lain  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 30, 2010

Date Mailed: June 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.

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:

