

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: 2010-37644

Issue No: 2009

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

September 23, 2010

Isabella 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 an in-person hearing was held on September 23, 2010. Claimant personally appeared and testified along with his wife J. M. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] Hearing Representative, [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and retro MA?

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 11, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and retro MA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 22, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform his past relevant work.
- (3) On February 24, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.

- (4) On May 24, 2010 claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On June 15, 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 is a 56 year old man whose birth date is March 12, 1954. Claimant is 5'9" tall and weighs 210 lbs. Claimant attended 12th grade but has no diploma or GED, and can only write his name, read very little, and do simple math.
- (7) Claimant states that he last worked in 2009 as a millwright/laborer, job he has had since 1998. Claimant has also worked in landscaping from 2007 to 2008, as a laborer in 2000, and as a tire changed from 1996 to 1998.
- (8) Claimant currently lives with a friend and receives food stamps. Claimant has a driver's license but does not drive because he has no vehicle and due to painful back. Claimant cooks, grocery shops with his daughter, does some house cleaning, and little outside work.
- (9) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: learning disability, shortness of breath, chronic back pain, arthritis, hypertension, heart catherization, anxiety and tobacco abuse.
- (10) Claimant has applied for Social Security disability and been denied and is appealing the denial.

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 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 4 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 4 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 2009. 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 was admitted to the hospital on September 24, 2009 with complaint of chest pain. Cardiac catheterization revealed a blockage and claimant underwent coronary artery bypass grafting. Claimant has a history of stent placement in 2002. Claimant was discharged on October 3, 2009 in stable condition. Discharge diagnoses include coronary artery disease status post coronary artery bypass grafting, hypercholesterolemia, hypertension, history of tobacco abuse, and history of medication noncompliance.

Claimant was seen for a follow up of his chest pain on [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Claimant reported that his discomfort is almost always after he eats and really does not bother him too much at other times. Claimant was using liquid Maalox without difficulty. Claimant reported having shortness of breath with exertion, but not while at rest. Claimant's blood pressure was 104/60 and he weighed 220.40 lbs. with regular pulse and regular and relaxed respirations. Claimant's chest was clear to auscultation, his chest wall was stable but tender to palpation, and incision has healed well. Claimant's heart had regular rhythm, and no murmurs, gallops or rubs were detected. Claimant was oriented to time, place, and person but anxious. No gross motor or sensory deficits were noted.

[REDACTED] evaluation for Disability Determination Service dated [REDACTED] quotes the claimant as saying his chief complaints are heart problems, bone disease, back, left hip, right shoulder, bone spurs in neck, and scoliosis. Claimant reported a history of chronic degenerative arthritis to his back over the past 23 years and that the pain radiates into the left hip. Claimant is not on any pain management and his only therapy now consists of walking. He has never had any surgical intervention and does not take pain medications. Claimant uses a cane about 10% of the time because of pain control. He also injured his right shoulder about three months ago playing basketball, but has not had any treatment for it.

Claimant also described his heart problems and that he had a stress test and a heart catheterization in January, 2010 which was stable. He continues to complain of chest pain mostly in the left breast that is non radiating, and describes it as a dull ache but it is reproducible with palpation.

Claimant had not worked since August of 2009 due to coronary disease. Claimant was living with his wife, can do activities of daily living, plays on the computer and with his grandchildren, and can walk about ½ mile, sit and stand about 20 minutes, and lift about 15 lbs.

On physical exam claimant's blood pressure was 128/80 and pulse 72 and regular. There was wheezing in the chest upon exhaling, but no rales or rhonchi and no accessory muscle use. Heart was of regular rate and rhythm without enlargement, and there was normal S1 and S2. Vascularly there was no clubbing or cyanosis appreciated, no edema present, and the peripheral pulses are intact. Musculoskeletal exam revealed no evidence of joint laxity, crepitation, or effusion, grip strength remains intact and dexterity is unimpaired. Claimant had no difficulty getting on and off the examination table, no difficulty heel and toe walking, no difficulty squatting, and mild difficulty hopping. Straight leg raising produced pain in the back at 60 degrees on the left. There was evidence of some scoliosis of the lower neck and upper lumbar spine area. Neurologically claimant's motor strength and tone are normal, sensory is intact to light touch and pinprick, reflexes are 2+ and symmetrical, Romberg testing is negative, and the claimant walks with a normal gait without the use of an assist device.

Conclusion are that of arthritis in the back and coronary disease. While the claimant injured his left shoulder playing basketball, this may be a simple strain. There were no findings of heart failure and his vitals were stable. Avoidance of repetitious twisting, pushing, pulling or lifting would be indicated more due to his back.

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. These impairments have lasted for 12 months. Claimant has therefore met his burden of proof at Step 2 and analysis continues.

At Step 3 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. Accordingly, claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

At Step 4, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant is not capable of performing his past relevant work. Work History Report form, SSA-3369-BK, indicates that the claimant's most recent job as a millwright/laborer entailed building corn bins from ground up. Claimant had to walk, stand, climb, kneel, crouch, crawl and reach 10-12 hours per day, lift tools-motors between 20 to 30 feet from the ground up, and climb ladders 80 to 120 ft. in the air with tools. Claimant is not disqualified at Step 4.

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 other 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 [REDACTED], published by the [REDACTED]... 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).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

Claimant has submitted sufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform tasks from his prior employment, or that he is physically unable to do more than light work if demanded of him. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, an individual of advanced age (claimant is 56 years old), with limited education (claimant does not have a high school diploma or a GED) and a skilled or semi-skilled work history with skills that are not transferable (such as claimant's) who

can perform only light work is considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 202.02. It is noted that the State Hearing Review Team found the claimant capable of light work per Vocational Rule 202.21 which applies to younger individuals age 18-44.

The claimant has presented the required competent, material, and substantial evidence which would support a finding that the claimant has an impairment or combination of impairments which would significantly limit the physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(c). The clinical documentation submitted by the claimant is sufficient to establish a finding that the claimant is disabled. There is objective medical evidence to substantiate the claimant's claim that the alleged impairment(s) are severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disabled. The claimant is disabled for the purposes of the Medical Assistance disability (MA-P) program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department improperly denied claimant's MA and retro MA application.

Accordingly, the department's decision is REVERSED. Department shall:

1. Process claimant's disputed December 11, 2009 MA and retro MA application and grant him any such benefits he is otherwise eligible for (i.e. meets financial and non-financial eligibility requirements).
2. Notify the claimant of this determination.
3. Review claimant's ongoing eligibility in November, 2011, at which time updated medical records are to be obtained.

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.

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:

