

STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2010-33690
Issue No: 2009, 4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 12, 2010
Macomb County DHS (12)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain for Jana Bachman

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 October 12, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge Jana Bachman. Judge Bachman is no longer affiliated with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System Administrative Hearings for the Department of Human Services. This hearing decision was completed by Administrative Law Judge Landis Y. Lain by considering the entire record.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly determine that claimant was no longer disabled and deny her review application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) based upon medical improvement?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- (1) Claimant was a Medical Assistance benefit recipient and his Medical Assistance case was scheduled for review in March 1, 2010.
- (2) On March 1, 2010, claimant filed a review application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging continued disability.
- (3) On April 4, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant had medical improvement.

- (4) On April 23, 2010, the department case worker sent claimant notice that his review application would be cancelled based upon medical improvement.
- (5) On May 3, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (6) On May 18, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's review application and requested additional medical information in the form of a complete physical examination and a psychiatric evaluation.
- (7) Claimant was scheduled for both an internist and a psychological evaluation. Claimant was a no show for both the internist and psychological evaluations according to the department caseworker.
- (8) On the date of hearing claimant was a 45-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5' 2" tall and weighs 165 pounds. Claimant completed the 8th grade. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
- (9) Claimant last worked in 2005 doing roofing and construction.
- (10) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: bi-polar disorder, schizophrenia, bad back and leg pain.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

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).

In general, claimant has the responsibility to prove that he/she 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.

Once an individual has been determined to be "disabled" for purposes of disability benefits, continued entitlement to benefits must be periodically reviewed. In evaluating whether an individual's disability continues, 20 CFR 416.994 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activities, severity of impairment(s), and the possibility of medical improvement and its relationship to the individual's ability to work are assessed. Review may cease and benefits may be continued at any point if there is substantial evidence to find that the individual is unable to engage in substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5).

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(i). In this case, the claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since 2005.

Secondly, if the individual has an impairment or combination of impairments which meet or equal the severity of an impairment listed in Appendix 1 to Subpart P of Part 404 of Chapter 20, disability is found to continue. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii).

The objective medical evidence in the record indicates that a psychiatric examination report dated [REDACTED] indicates that claimant had a GAF of 50 and last year GAF of 50. He was diagnosed with bi-polar unspecified and polysubstance dependence which is 2 ½ years in remission as well as hypertension and high cholesterol (pp. 54-55).

A [REDACTED] medical examination report indicates that claimant was 5'3" tall and weighed 171 pounds. His pulse was 90 and blood pressure is 124/81. Vision without glasses is 20/20 bilaterally. The claimant is alert and oriented. He was cooperative and coherent. The claimant was not in any acute distress. Examination of the TLS spine reveals curvature to be midline. There is no tenderness or spasm in the posterior spinal palpation with tenderness or spasms noted. Range of motion was done. Lumbo pelvic rhythm is slightly impaired. Straight leg raising, faber's, galen's, femoral stress test

were all non contributory. Muscle strength is 5/5. Deep tendon reflexes intact. No pathological reflexes. Sensory was intact. Coordination was intact. Gait was contributory. The claimant can dress, undress, get on and off the table. The claimant is not using any ambulatory aide and is not in need of one. He can squat less than half way. He can do heel, toe and tandem walking with difficulty. The impression is the history of chronic pain, non-traumatic, diagnosed with bulging disc of L4-L5 and L5-S1 per claimant's history. Now presenting with chronic radicular low back pain with no definite objective findings as of the date of examination and a history of a mental impairment (pp. 51-52).

At Step 2, claimant's impairments do not equal or meet the severity of an impairment listed in Appendix 1.

In the third step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact must determine whether there has been medical improvement as defined in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i). 20 CFR 416.994 (b)(5)(iii). Medical improvement is defined as any decrease in the medical severity of the impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision that the claimant was disabled or continues to be disabled. A determination that there has been a decrease in medical severity must be based on changes (improvement) in the symptoms, signs, and/or laboratory findings associated with claimant's impairment(s). If there has been medical improvement as shown by a decrease in medical severity, the trier of fact must proceed to Step 4 (which examines whether the medical improvement is related to the claimant's ability to do work). If there has been no decrease in medical severity and thus no medical improvement, the trier of fact moves to Step 5 in the sequential evaluation process.

In the instant case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant does have medical improvement and his medical improvement is related to the claimant's ability to perform substantial gainful activity.

Thus, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant's. If there is a finding of medical improvement related to claimant's ability to perform work, the trier of fact is to move to Step 6 in the sequential evaluation process.

In the sixth step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to determine whether the claimant's current impairment(s) is severe per 20 CFR 416.921. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vi). If the residual functional capacity assessment reveals significant limitations upon a claimant's ability to engage in basic work activities, the trier of fact moves to Step 7 in the sequential evaluation process. In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds claimant can perform at least sedentary work even with his impairments. This Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant can at least perform sedentary work even with his impairments based upon the objective medical evidence contained in the file.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

In the instant case, claimant did not show up for his medical examination reports which had been ordered by the department.

If an individual fails to cooperate by appearing for a physical or mental examination by a certain date without good cause, there will not be a finding of disability. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(ii).

In the seventh step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to assess a claimant's current ability to engage in substantial gainful activities in accordance with 20 CFR 416.960 through 416.969. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vii). The trier of fact is to assess the claimant's current residual functional capacity based on all current impairments and consider whether the claimant can still do work he/she has done in the past. In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant could probably perform his past work as a construction worker.

In the final step, Step 8, of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to consider whether the claimant can do any other work, given the claimant's residual function capacity and claimant's age, education, and past work experience. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(viii). In this case, based up on the claimant's vocational profile of , MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule as a guide. Claimant can perform other work in the form of light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b). This Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant does have medical improvement in this case and 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 proposed to cancel claimant's Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits based upon medical improvement.

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, page 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.

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 continued disability and 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. Claimant does not have medical improvement based upon the objective medical findings in the file.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.

Landis _____ /s/ _____
Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 17, 2011

Date Mailed: August 19, 2011

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:

