

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2010-43007  
Issue No: 2009; 4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
August 24, 2010  
Allegan 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 August 24, 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 November 19, 2009, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, State Disability Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On June 14, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant could perform other work.
- (3) On June 09, 2010, the department case worker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On July 2, 2010, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On July 23, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation:

Claimant is capable of performing other work in the form of light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b) pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.17.

- (6) Claimant is a 32-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'11" tall and weighs 172 pounds. Claimant attended the 11 grade and has no GED. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
- (7) Claimant last worked approximately 6 years ago, delivering dry wall and driving a truck. Claimant has also worked as a dishwasher in a restaurant.
- (8) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: stomach problems, knee, wrist and ankle injury, gun shot wound to the left side of his mid-section in 2003, a motor vehicle accident in 2008, with a shattered left knee, 4 hernia surgeries, and a calf line mesh in the abdomen, left ankle cut off and reattached at age 10, back and neck problems, and a blown disc. Claimant alleges 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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 since approximately 2003. 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 lives with his grandfather in a house and he is single with no children under 18. Claimant has no income but does receive Food Assistance Program benefits. Claimant's driver's license is suspended and his friends drive him where he needs to go. Claimant does cook 2 times per day, and usually puts things in the microwave. He does grocery shop 3-4 times per month and needs help putting things in the basket. Claimant testified that a cleaning lady cleans the home and his hobbies are bingo and watching TV 4-5 hours a day. Claimant testified that he can stand for 1 minute, sit for 10-15 minutes, walk to the car and back, but cannot squat. Claimant testified that he can bend at the waist and shower and dress himself, and can only tie his right shoe, and can only touch his toes on his right side. Claimant testified that his level of pain on a scale from 1-10 without medication is a 6 and with medication is a 1-2. Claimant testified that he is right handed and he has problems with his left hand where the pinky finger was ripped off and reattached. Claimant testified that his legs and feet are bad and the heaviest weight he can carry is a half gallon of milk. Claimant testified that he does not smoke or drink. He does have a methamphetamine conviction from 2003, but no longer uses drugs.

A March 19, 2010, radiology report indicates that there is an old fracture of the patella. There was no acute fracture line or mal-alignment of the fractured fragments. A considerable portion of the patella is obscured on the two provided used by 4 embedded surgical screws and circumferential surgical wire. The doctor saw no other acute traumatic or intrinsic osseous abnormalities. There was minimal narrowing of the

patellofemoral joint without secondary spurri ng, eburnation, or erosive change along opposing surfaces. The femorotibial joint is well maintained with minor marginal spurring and eburnation. There is no ev idence of an effusion or loose body. Surrounding soft tissue is intact (p. 26).

A physical examination dated M arch 19, 2010, claimant wa s cooperative in answering questions and following commands. The claim ant's immediate, recent, and remote memory was intact with normal concentration. The claimant's insight and judgment are both appropriate. The claimant provides a good effort during the examination. Mental status was normal. Vital signs: the blood pressure in the left arm was 118/66, pulse was 76 and regular. Respiratory rate was 24, weight was 169 pounds, height wa s 68.75" without shoes. Skin wa s normal other than a 12" inci sion noted over the lateral aspects of the left knee. Eyes and Ears: vis ual acuity in the right eye is 20/10 and the left eye 20/10 without corrective lenses. Pup ils are equal, round and reactiv e to light. The claimant could hear conversational spec h without limitations or aids. The nec k was supple without m asses. The chest: breat h sounds were clear to auscultation a nd symmetrical. There is no accessory muscle use. The heart: there was regular rate and rhythm without enlargement. There was a no rmal S1 and S2. In the abdomen, there was no or ganomegaly or masses. Bowel sounds were normal. In the vas cular area, there was no clubbing or cyanos is detected. There was no edema appreciated. T he peripheral pulses were intact. In the musculo skeletal area, there wa s no evidenc e of joint crepitance or effusion. There is posit ive drawer sign of about 1 inch. There is a half inch laxity with varus and valdus testi ng. There is synovial thickening over the patellar joint. Grip strength remains intact. Dexterity is unimpaired. The claimant could pick up a coin, button clothing and open a door. The claimant had no difficulty getting on and off the examination table, was unable to heel and toe walk, severe difficulty squatting and unable to hop. Stra ight leg raising is negative. There is no paravertebral muscle spasm. Range of motion studies of the joints were all normal. In the neurologic area cranial nerves were intact. Motor strength was 4/5 with left knee fle xion an extension. Sensory is intact to light touch and pin prick. There areflexia in the left knee. Romberg testing is negative. The claimants walks with a severe left sided limp, without the use of an assist device. The conclusion was left knee injury. He did have significan degeneration of the anter ior compartment with associat ed weakness with flexion and extension of the knee. He is unable to weight bear on the left leg. He does compensate with a severe left sided limp. He does require the use of a can and and brace for pain control. Unfortunately, his lungs and prognosis does appear poor from an orthopedic standpoint (p.22-25).

This Administrative Law Judge did consi der all 192 pages of medical information contained in the file in making this decision.

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establis hing 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. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file. The clinical impression is 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, 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 disabling mental impairments.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient 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 oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. 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 his past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied a gain 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).

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. 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 32), with a less than high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to sedentary 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. BEM, 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.

Landis

/s/

Y. Lain

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

Date Signed: August 30, 2010

Date Mailed: August

**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:

