

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-52540

Issue No: 2009; 4031

Case No:

[REDACTED]
Newaygo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne L. Morris

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 December 15, 2011. The claimant appeared and provided the testimony along with [REDACTED], a friend. [REDACTED] provided testimony on behalf of the department.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 July 21, 2011, claimant applied for MA and SDA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS).
2. Claimant did not apply for Retro MA.
3. On August 30, 2011, the MRT denied.
4. On September 6, 2011, the DHS issued notice.
5. On September 9, 2011, claimant filed a hearing request.
6. Claimant testified at the administrative hearing that he has an SSI application pending with the Social Security Administration (SSA).

7. On November 12, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant.
8. As of the date of hearing, claimant was a [REDACTED] male standing 6' 4" tall and weighing 198 pounds. Claimant has a high school diploma.
9. Claimant testified that he does not use any illicit drugs. Claimant testified he smokes approximately 1 pack of cigarettes per day. Claimant also testified that he occasionally drinks alcohol approximately a 12-pack each week.
10. Claimant testified that he does not have a driver's license and has never had one.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant testified he last worked in 2010 for a produce company but that employment was part-time and seasonal and that he only did it for about 2-3 months. Claimant had no other substantial employment other than some jobs he held while he was incarcerated.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of seizures, depression and anxiety.
13. On September 12, 2009, the claimant was admitted to [REDACTED] for seizures. Neurologic examinations found he was awake, alert, and oriented times 3. His mental status was normal except for a somewhat diminished attention span. He was able to move all four extremities against gravity very well. He was not very cooperative for a formal motor examination. His sensory examination was normal to light touch and pinprick. No sensory level. He had normal finger to nose and heel to shin coordination. The physician's assessment was that the client's seizures were most likely consistent either with pseudoseizures or malingering. The client was totally aware of himself when he was having either jerking or string episodes and he knew what was going on around him. He stated that he was thinking in his mind to control the jerking but was unable to. At times the client stated that he could not move at all but was totally coherent. A CAT scan of the brain was unremarkable. The physician discontinued claimant's Dilantin and Tegretol and instead started him on Keppra.
14. An EEG performed on September 12, 2009 found a normal EEG no focal lateralized or epileptiform features were noted.
15. The claimant was discharged on September 14, 2009, with a diagnosis of seizure disorder with increased frequency of seizure felt to be medication related.

16. On January 6, 2010, the claimant underwent a Consultative Psychiatric Examination. Mental status exam found the claimant to be oriented and able to fully understand questions, alert throughout the interview, cooperative with good eye contact. His speech was disarticulate, very slightly and occasionally but otherwise with normal rate prosody. His language was appropriate to the age and situation, his motor activity was normal with no motor or vocal ticks, tremors, or dyskinesia. His affect was slightly constricted, his stream of thought was logical, coherent and appropriate for his age. His content of thought contained no overt psychotic thoughts or behaviors. He had no suicidal or homicidal ideation, intent or plans. He had good recent and long-term memory. His insight and judgments were good. He was diagnosed with an anxiety disorder, NOS, history for polysubstance abuse in full remission per self report and assigned a current GAF of 70. The claimant was able to understand, remember and carry out simple instructions without difficulty including three step commands. The clinician opined that one may infer from the information obtained in his performance during the evaluation that he would have from none to moderate difficulty detailed instructions especially if not written down in simple short sentences. One may infer from the information obtained in his performance during evaluation that he would interact with the public, supervisor, and co-workers in a similar manner.
17. A June 11, 2011 CT of the head found no acute intracranial abnormalities. The impression was a normal CT of the head.
18. On July 16, 2011, the claimant was admitted to the hospital, a CT scan of the head done on July 17, 2011, showed no definite acute intracranial process. An MRI of the brain performed on July 18, 2011, showed no evidence of hemorrhage neoplastic change or recent eschismic event. An EEG was conducted on July 18, 2011, and showed no epileptiform discharges were recorded. The claimant was discharged on July 20, 2011 with diagnosis of Seizure-like episode most likely psychogenic nonepileptic seizures, history of epilepsy, depression/anxiety, and history of hypertension, Thrombocytopenia and episodic chest pain resolved.

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 Bridges Reference Manual (RFT).

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 (RFT).

Statutory authority for the SDA program states in part:

- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

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).

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). This second step is a *de minimus* standard. Ruling any ambiguities in claimant's favor, this Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that claimant meets both. The analysis continues.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meets or equals one of the Listings of Impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Claimant does not. The analysis continues.

Before considering step four 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 96-8. It is the opinion of this Administrative

Law Judge that the claimant would be capable of a wide range of medium work while avoiding unprotected heights or heavy machinery.

Next, the Administrative Law Judge must determine at step four 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.

In this case, this ALJ finds that claimant does not have a substantial past relevant work history to make a finding on. Therefore, the analysis will continue.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process, 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. 20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacked the residual functional capacity to perform at least medium work if demanded of him. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant had no residual functional capacity to perform other work. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he could not perform at least medium work with some restrictions ie, avoiding unprotected heights and heavy machinery. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual with a high school education and an unskilled or no work history is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 203.28.

The 6th 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 (6th cir 1988).

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.

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/
Suzanne L. Morris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 6/4/12

Date Mailed: 6/4/12

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.

SLM/jk



