

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201113287  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 14, 2011  
St Joseph County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. Spodarek

**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 June 14, 2011. Claimant was represented at the administrative hearing by [REDACTED], collecting on behalf of a hospital.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) application?

**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 June 1, 2010, claimant applied for MA with the Michigan DHS. Claimant did not indicate that she was disabled on her application. On July 6, 2010, claimant reapplied for MA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS). On the reapplication claimant did indicate she was disabled. The reapplication is at issue herein.
2. Claimant applied for 1 month of retro MA.
3. On October 1, 2010, the MRT denied.
4. On October 4, 2010, the DHS issued notice.
5. On January 3, 2011, claimant filed a hearing request.
6. Claimant testified that she just applied for SSI as, "I am not sure I can work." Claimant has an SSI application pending with the Social Security Administration (SSA).

7. On February 10, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant. Pursuant to the claimant's request to hold the record open for the submission of new and additional medical documentation on July 12, 2011 SHRT once again denied claimant.
8. As of the date of application, claimant was a 21-year-old female standing 4'10" tall and weighing 185 pounds. Claimant's BMI is 38.7 classifying claimant as obese under the Medical Index. Claimant has an associates degree.
9. Claimant does not have an alcohol/drug abuse problem or history. Claimant does not smoke.
10. Claimant does not have a driver's license. Claimant testified she has never taken the exam.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant testified that she does not have any significant work history. Claimant has babysat.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of pancreatitis, gall stones, back pain.
13. The February 10, 2011 SHRT findings and conclusions of its decision are adopted and incorporated by reference to the following extent:

8/10 physical exam reports claimant had normal range of motion of all joints. Gait normal. Intact sensory and motor. Able to maintain her weight at 183 pounds...Analysis: Objective medical evidence does not establish disability at the listing or equivalence level. Capable of medium work. Denied per Rule 203.28 as a guide.
14. The subsequent July 12, 2011 SHRT decision is adopted and incorporated to the following extent:

New medical data: In 11/10 claimant was doing better. Exam basically within normal limits. In 6/10 claimant had extensive admissions with gall stones, pancreatitis and sepsis. Developed acute respiratory and acute renal failure. Condition eventually improved with treatment and she was noted to recover completely at discharge. In 8/10 and 11/10 exams basically within normal limits. Denied due to lack of duration per 20 CFR 416.909.
15. A DHS-49 completed August 3, 2010 indicates that for Type 1 diabetes, and history of pancreatitis claimant had all normal evaluations except for

large abdominal surgery scar. Claimant's condition was stable and improving. Claimant was noted to have "no physical limitations." Exhibit 71. Claimant was also noted to have no mental limitations.

16. A DHS-54A completed on or about August, 2010 indicates that claimant's condition would require four weeks of medical treatment and eight weeks to be off work. See Exhibit 74.
17. New medical indicates improvement as compared to the initial medical documentation.
18. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that she is capable of engaging in activities of daily living, and does not need any assistance with her bathroom and grooming needs. Claimant can cook, clean, do laundry, shop.

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

In order to receive MA benefits based upon disability or blindness, claimant must be disabled or blind as defined in Title XVI of the Social Security Act (20 CFR 416.901). DHS, being authorized to make such disability determinations, utilizes the SSI definition of disability when making medical decisions on MA applications. MA-P (disability), also is known as Medicaid, which is a program designated to help public assistance claimants pay their medical expenses. Michigan administers the federal Medicaid program. In assessing eligibility, Michigan utilizes the federal regulations.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

"Disability" is:

...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.

The federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

...We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of

your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b). If no, the analysis continues to Step 2.
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 416.909(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 that meets the duration requirement? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(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. Sections 200.00-204.00(f)?
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? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do other work. If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to:

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required by claimant to establish statutory disability. The regulations essentially require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate claimant's claims or claimant's physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

...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 sure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...The medical evidence...must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.
- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques. Psychiatric signs are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated.
- (c) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the

use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

- (1) The nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question;
- (2) The probable duration of your impairment; and
- (3) Your residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques.... 20 CFR 416.927(a)(1).

It is noted that Congress removed obesity from the Listing of Impairments shortly after the removal of drug addiction and alcoholism. This removal reflects the view that there is a strong behavioral component to obesity. Thus, obesity in-and-of itself is not sufficient to show statutory disability.

Applying the sequential analysis herein, claimant is not ineligible at the first step as claimant is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). After careful review of the substantial and credible evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge concurs with the July 12, 2011 SHRT Decision denying claimant for lack of duration per 20 CFR 416.909.

In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that the 49s and 54A do not show that duration is met at all. Claimant's longest time period identified as creating a problem for her to work would be eight weeks from her hospitalization in June 2010. Subsequent follow-ups in

August 2010 and November 2010 indicates claimant's exam were basically within normal limits. Statutory disability is not shown.

As noted above, claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to 20 CFR 416.912(c). Federal and state law is quite specific with regards to the type of evidence sufficient to show statutory disability. 20 CFR 416.913. This authority requires sufficient medical evidence to substantiate and corroborate statutory disability as it is defined under federal and state law. 20 CFR 416.913(b), .913(d), and .913(e); BEM 260. These medical findings must be corroborated by medical tests, labs, and other corroborating medical evidence that substantiates disability. 20 CFR 416.927, .928. Moreover, complaints and symptoms of pain must be corroborated pursuant to 20 CFR 416.929(a), .929(c)(4), and .945(e). Claimant's medical evidence in this case, taken as a whole, simply does not rise to statutory disability by meeting these federal and state requirements. 20 CFR 416.920; BEM 260, 261.

The 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit has held that subjective complaints are inadequate to establish disability when the objective evidence fails to establish the existence of severity of the alleged pain. *McCormick v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 861 F2d 998, 1003 (6<sup>th</sup> cir 1988).

It is also noted that claimant initially applied and did not indicate that she was disabled. Moreover, claimant indicated that she has not applied for Social Security disability because she has not determined that she was unable to work.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is UPHeld.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Janice G. Spodarek  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 23, 2011

Date Mailed: September 27, 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 mailing date of the rehearing decision.

JGS/db

cc:

