

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201111301
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: 8249000000
Hearing Date:
[REDACTED]
Wayne County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: [REDACTED]

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 hearing was held on [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Was the denial of claimant's application for MA-P and SDA for lack of disability correct?

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 applied for MA-P and SDA on [REDACTED].
- (2) Claimant is [REDACTED] years old.
- (3) Claimant has a high school education with three years of college.
- (4) Claimant is not currently working.

- (5) Claimant has a history of hidradenitis suppurativa (HS), with extensive skin lesions involving both axillae and both inguinal areas that persist for at least three months despite continuing treatment as prescribed.
- (6) Claimant has had two surgeries to drain HS lesions in the past year.
- (7) These lesions significantly interfere with claimant's ability to perform job-related activities.
- (8) Claimant, at the time of the hearing, had been dealing with her current lesions for over three months.
- (9) On [REDACTED] the Medical Review Team denied MA-P and SDA, stating that claimant was disqualified because she was able to perform her past relevant work.
- (10) On [REDACTED] claimant filed for hearing.
- (11) On [REDACTED], the State Hearing Review Team denied MA-P, Retro MA-P, and SDA, stating that claimant did not have a significant impairment.
- (12) On [REDACTED], a hearing was held before the Administrative Law Judge.

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 Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

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 Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition of the term “disabled” as is used by the Social Security Administration for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

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

This is determined by a five step sequential evaluation process where current work activity, the severity and duration of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are considered. These factors are always considered in order according to the five step sequential evaluation, and when a determination can be made at any step as to the claimant’s disability status, no analysis of subsequent steps are necessary. 20 CFR 416.920

The first step that must be considered is whether the claimant is still partaking in Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA). 20 CFR 416.920(b). To be considered disabled, a person must be unable to engage in SGA. A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount (net of impairment-related work expenses) is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The amount of monthly earnings considered as SGA depends on the nature of a person's disability; the Social Security Act specifies a higher SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals and a lower SGA amount for non-blind individuals. Both SGA amounts increase with increases in the national average wage index. The monthly SGA amount for statutorily blind individuals for 2010 is [REDACTED]. For non-blind individuals, the monthly SGA amount for 2010 is [REDACTED].

In the current case, claimant has testified that she is not working, and the Department has presented no evidence or allegations that claimant is engaging in SGA. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant is not engaging in SGA, and thus passes the first step of the sequential evaluation process.

The second step that must be considered is whether or not the claimant has a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment expected to last 12 months or more (or result in death), which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. The term "basic work activities" means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the Department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. This is a *de minimus* standard in the disability determination that the court may use only to disregard trifling matters. As a rule, any impairment that can reasonably be expected to significantly impair basic activities is enough to meet this standard.

In the current case, claimant has presented sufficient evidence of hidradenitis suppurativa that has more than a minimal effect on the claimant’s ability to do basic work activities. The Department’s own examination shows that claimant is affected by this condition. The independent examiner stated that this is a life-long problem for which claimant will need ongoing care. Claimant will have difficulty with prolonged standing, stooping, squatting, lifting and bending. This analysis is supported by claimant’s treating source records.

These limitations are both severe and create significant impairments in claimant’s functioning, meet the durational requirements, and impair claimant’s ability to perform work-related activities. Thus, claimant easily passes Step 2 of our evaluation.

In the third step of the sequential evaluation, we must determine if the claimant’s impairment is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.925. This is, generally speaking, an objective standard; either claimant’s impairment is listed

in this appendix, or it is not. However, at this step, a ruling against the claimant does not direct a finding of “not disabled”; if the claimant’s impairment does not meet or equal a listing found in Appendix 1, the sequential evaluation process must continue on to step four.

The Administrative Law Judge finds that the claimant’s medical records contain medical evidence of an impairment that meets or equals a listed impairment.

Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR 404, Section 8.00 has this to say about skin disorders:

8.06 *Hidradenitis suppurativa*, with extensive skin lesions involving both axillae, both inguinal areas or the perineum that persist for at least 3 months despite continuing treatment as prescribed.

Claimant’s medical records clearly show that claimant has several lesions involving the axillae and the inguinal areas. These lesions have never been in remission, and while individual lesions may heal, other lesions continue to flare up. This disorder has worsened for the claimant over the past year. According to testimony, claimant currently has two lesions in her inguinal areas. Claimant, by any definition, meets the straight wording of this listing.

This is enough to satisfy the listings requirement of step 3, and a finding of disability is directed.

With regard to steps 4 and 5, when a determination can be made at any step as to the claimant’s disability status, no analysis of subsequent steps are necessary. 20 CFR 416.920. Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge sees no reason to continue his analysis, as a determination can be made at step 3.

With regard to the SDA program, a person is considered disabled for the purposes of SDA if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least 90 days. Other specific financial and non-financial eligibility criteria are found in PEM 261. As claimant meets the federal standards for SSI disability, as addressed above, the undersigned concludes that the claimant is disabled for the purposes of the SDA program as well.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the claimant is disabled for the purposes of the MA and SDA program. Therefore, the decisions to deny claimant's application for MA-P and SDA were incorrect.

Accordingly, the Department's decision in the above stated matter is, hereby, REVERSED.

The Department is ORDERED to process claimant's MA-P and SDA application and award required benefits, provided claimant meets all non-medical standards as well. The Department is further ORDERED to initiate a review of claimant's disability case in May 2012.

A handwritten signature is present, which has been almost entirely redacted with black ink. Only a few small, illegible characters remain visible.

Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 05/12/11

Date Mailed: 05/13/11

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.

RJC/dj

cc: [REDACTED]
Wayne County DHS (Dist #49) / DHS-1843

[REDACTED]

Administrative Hearings