

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

IN THE MATTER OF: \_\_\_\_\_,

\_\_\_\_\_

Reg. No: 20114472  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: \_\_\_\_\_  
Hearing Date: January 26, 2011  
Ingham 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 January 26, 2011. Claimant was represented at the administrative hearing by \_\_\_\_\_

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA-P) 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 7, 2010, claimant's representative an application for MA-P with the Michigan DHS.
2. Claimant applied for one month of retro MA.
3. On July 28, 2010, the MRT denied.
4. On July 30, 2010, the DHS issued notice.
5. On October 22, 2010, claimant filed a hearing request.
6. On December 7, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant. Pursuant to claimant's request to hold the record open for the submission of new and additional medical documentation, on February 9, 2011. SHRT once again denied claimant.

7. On August 19, 2011, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge received verification from the Social Security Administration (SSA) that claimant's SSI application with SSA was denied on August 4, 2011. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that he is alleging the same impairments. Claimant has been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. None of the exceptions apply.
8. As of the date of application, claimant was a 53-year-old male standing 6'1" tall and weighing 160 pounds. Claimant has a 12<sup>th</sup> grade education.
9. Claimant testified that he does not have any current alcohol/drug problems. Claimant testified no alcohol history. Claimant testified that two years ago he had a heroin addiction. Claimant smokes. Claimant has a nicotine addiction.
10. Claimant testified that he does not have a driver's license due to it being expired.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in 2007 where claimant indicates that he was a supervisor for a catering business in the [REDACTED]. Claimant's work history is semi-skilled work.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of shortness of breath, back pain, arthritis, stomach problems.
13. The December 7, 2010 and subsequent February 9, 2011 SHRT decisions are adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

### **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).

Prior to any substantive review, jurisdiction is paramount. Applicable to the case herein, policy states:

#### **Final SSI Disability Determination**

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
  - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**
  - .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. PEM, Item 260, pp. 2-3.

Relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until the determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(i). These regulations further provide: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the agency." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(ii).

In this case, evidence received from the Social Security Administration indicates that claimant received an unfavorable decision by a federal Administrative Law Judge on August 4, 2011. Claimant testified at the time of the administrative hearing that his application with SSA was pending. Claimant further testified that he is alleging the same impairments as the application filed with the Michigan DHS. Claimant's claim was considered by SSA and benefits denied. The determination was final. Claimant is alleging the same impairments. None of the exceptions apply.

For these reasons, under the above-cited policy and federal law, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction to proceed with a substantive review. The department's denial must be upheld.

As noted above, should the SSA change its determination, then the new determination would also be binding on the DHS.

In the alternative, should the sequential analysis be applied, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge would concur with the findings and conclusions of the SHRT decisions in finding claimant not disabled under federal law and state policy.

**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: August 23, 2011

Date Mailed: August 25, 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:

