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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:2011-8519Issue No:2009Case No:1000Hearing Date:March 2, 2011Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain for Jay W. Sexton

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 March 2, 2011. Claimant per sonally appeared a nd testified. Claimant was represented at the hearing by

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge Jay Sexton. Jay Sexton is no lon ger affiliated with the Michigan Adm inistrative Hearing System Administrative Hearings for the Department of Human Services. This hearing decision was completed by Administrative Law Judge Landis Y. Lain by considering the entire record.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P)?

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 28, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On September 15, 2010, the Medical Review T eam denied claimant's application stating that claimant c ould perform other work pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.17 and stated that clai mant should not work at unprotected heights or around dangerous moving machinery.

- (3) On September 15, 2010, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On November 29, 2010, claimant's representative filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On December 15, 2010, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application st ating in its' analy sis and recommendation: the claimant has a history of substance abuse. She reports hearing voices watching her from outside the and being worried that someone was window. She reported similar symptoms in June 2009 during a psychiatric admission. At that time, they felt her psychotic symptoms were very obviously manufactured. She tested positive for cocaine in June 2010 Her physic al findings were unremark able. Public Law 104-121 is cited due to the materiality of drug and al cohol abuse. The claimant's impairment's do not meet/equal the intent or seve rity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of si mple unskilled work. In lieu of detailed work history, t he claimant will be retu rned to other work. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of a younger individual, limited education and a hi story of unskilled and semiskilled work, MA-P is denied using Vocation al Rule 204.00(H) as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied.
- (6) The hearing was held on March 2, 2011. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
- (7) Additional medical information wa s submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on March 8, 2011.
- On March 23, 2011, the State Hear ing Review Team approved c laimant (8) for Medical Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits stating in its' analysis and recommendation: the objective medical evidence does not support the findings of an MRT and SHRT. Drug and alcohol abus e are not material but involved in this case. The psychiatric medical opinion cannot be refuted by the ev idence in the file. The claimant does not meet/equal any listing level criter is but likewise did not retain the ability to perform si mple and repetitive tasks. compounded by eroded residual physical a bilities. T he cla imant's impairment's do not meet/equal the intent or severity of an appropriate Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates t hat the claimant retains the c apacity to perform a light exertional range of work. The claimant does not retain the ability to perform even simple and repetitive tasks. However, based on the claimant's vocational profile of 45 years old, high school equivalent education and a hist ory of self-emp loyment, MA-P is approved using Vocational Rule 201.00 as a guide. Retroac tive MA-P was considered in

this case and is approved effective March 2010. SDA was not applied for by the c laimant but w ould have been a pproved in accordanc e with PEM 261. This case needs to be review ed for continuing MA-P benefits in March 2012.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An oppor tunity for a hearing shall be granted to an ap plicant who requests a hearing because his or her clai m for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients h ave the right to contes t a department decision affecting elig ibility or benefit levels whenev er it is believed that the decis ion is incorrect. The department will provide an adm inistrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of the C ode 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).

Because of the SHRT determination it is not necess ary for the Administrative Law Judge to discuss the issue of dis ability per BAM, Item 600. The department is required to initiate a determination of the claimant's financial eligibility for the requested benefits if not previously done. Claimant alleges as disabling impairment's: anxiety, depression, bi-polar with a history of psychotic features, suicide attempts, hearing voices, chest pain, foot pain, leg pain, syncope, and memory problems as well as Class C III heart failure and multiple substance abuse problems.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, decides that the claimant meets the definition of medically dis abled under the Medical As sistance program as of March 2010 per the State Hearing Rev iew Teams March 23, 2011, decision.

Accordingly, the department's decision is REVERSED. The department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the June 28, 2010, Medical Assistance and retroactive Medicial Assistance application if it has not already done so to determine if all other non-medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform the claimant of a determination in writing.

The department is ORDERED to conduct a medica I review of claimant's case in March 2012. At review, the department needs to assi st claimant in providing the following: medical packet, DHS-49B, D, E, F, G; all hospital and treat ing source not es and tes t

Landis

results; all consultative examinations inc luding those purchased by the Socia I Administration/Disability Determination Service.

> <u>/s/</u> Y. Lain Administrative Law Judge for Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 18, 2011

Date Mailed: August 18, 2011

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not orde r a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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:

