

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2011-11219  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 6, 2011  
DHS County: Macomb (50-36)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Jonathan W. Owens

**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 6, 2011, in Sterling Heights, MI. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. The Department of Human Services (Department) was represented by [REDACTED].

The record was extended to allow the submission of additional medical documentation. SHRT received the updated medical and issued a denial on November 28, 2011. It should be noted SHRT obtained a copy of a Disability Determination Service (DDS) exam completed by an internist on [REDACTED]. These records were noted in support of their denial. These records were not obtained in accordance with the record extension. Therefore, these records and any findings based on these records are excluded from consideration in this decision and order. The Department's attempt to include records not authorized at hearing is an attempt at *ex parte* communication and cannot be tolerated.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) program?

**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 August 25, 2010, Claimant applied for MA-P and retro MA-P.
2. On September 9, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied Claimant's request.

3. On December 10, 2010, Claimant submitted to the Department a request for hearing.
4. The State Hearing and Review Team (SHRT) denied Claimant's request.
5. Claimant is 40 years old.
6. Claimant completed education through high school with some college.
7. Claimant has employment experience (last worked February 2008) as an inspector in a factory and as a carpet inspector.
8. Claimant suffers from ADHD, acute vasculitis, agoraphobia, social anxiety, bipolar disorder and depression.
9. Claimant has significant limitations on understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions; use of judgment; responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and dealing with changes in a routine work setting.
10. SHRT returned a denial on November 28, 2011, after reviewing the newly submitted medical.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

MA-P 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 administers MA-P 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).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under MA-P. Under SSI, 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.

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience are reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work). 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

Claimant testified to the following symptoms and abilities: deep depressive thoughts, struggles to go out in public, not able to go out and shop, stays alone in his room, struggles with eating too much or too little, drowsy due to his medications, panic attacks, feels helpless, arthritic knee, knee swells, can stand 2 hours out of 8 hours, no problem with sitting, can walk ½ mile, poor attention and recall, no problems bending over, no problems with grip and grasp, needs help with household chores, goes into states of depression and fails to clean, able to manage personal care, once in a great while he will have a crying spell, no suicidal thoughts, no hallucinations, sleep is disturbed, either over sleeps or can't sleep and has panic attacks 4-5 times a week. Claimant presented medical evidence from a psychiatric physician demonstrating marked impairment in several areas of the mental residual social function assessment.

In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant may be considered presently disabled at the third step. Claimant appears to meet listing 12.04 or its equivalent. This Administrative Law Judge will not continue through the remaining steps of the assessment. Claimant's testimony and the medical documentation support the finding that Claimant meets the requirements of a listing.


Therefore, Claimant is found to be disabled.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Claimant is medically disabled as of May 2010.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby REVERSED and the Department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application dated August 25, 2010, if not done previously, to determine Claimant's non-medical eligibility. The Department shall inform

Claimant of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for January 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Jonathan W. Owens**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 14, 2011

Date Mailed: December 14, 2011

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (60 days for FAP cases)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt 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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing **MAY** be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at  
Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

JWO/pf

cc:

