

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-23886
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 16, 2011
Branch County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

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 16, 2011. Claimant was represented at the hearing by [REDACTED].

This hearing was originally held by Administrative Law Judge Jay Sexton. Jay Sexton is no longer affiliated with the Michigan Administrative 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) and retroactive Medical Assistance (retro 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 August 9, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability. On August 26, 2010, [REDACTED] asked to sign on the claimant's application via fax.
- (2) On December 28, 2010, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform prior relevant work.

- (3) On January 4, 2011, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On March 4, 2011, claimant's rep filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On March 30, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: the Medical Review Team requested local Department of Human Services office to request that claimant attend a physical medical examination. Two examinations were scheduled and the claimant failed to attend either examination. The objective medical evidence supports a finding of the MRT. The claimant retains the physical residual functional capacity to perform medium exertional work. The claimant's past work was medium and semi-skilled in nature. Therefore, the claimant retains the capacity to perform her past relevant work as a restaurant manager and housekeeper supervisor. MA-P is denied per 20 CFR 416.920(e). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA was not applied for by the claimant but would have been denied per PEM 261 due to the capacity to perform past relevant work. Listings 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 3.02, 3.02, 4.02, 4.05, and 11.14 were considered in this determination.
- (6) The hearing was held on June 16, 2011. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
- (7) Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on August 12, 2011.
- (8) On September 19, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommended decision: the objective medical evidence does not support SHRT's determination. Although the claimant is experiencing pain of the back the coordination is normal with normal sensory and motor deficit. There were no reports of complications of the lungs and heart. There is no evidence of a severe mental or physical condition. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform past work of a housekeeper. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile of a younger individual, 12th grade education and unskilled work history, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.20 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and has also been denied.
- (9) On the date of hearing claimant was a 48-year-old woman whose date of birth is [REDACTED]. Claimant was 5'9" tall and weighed 145 pounds.

Claimant is a high school graduate. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.

- (10) Claimant last worked as a daycare provider and at the [REDACTED] as a supervisor of housekeeping and as a rental clerk and a sales representative.
- (11) Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: back pain, emphysema, bronchitis, congestive heart failure, Wolf-Parkinson-White's syndrome.

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 opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. 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 is 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.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

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

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include --

- (1) Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling;
- (2) Capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking;
- (3) Understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions;
- (4) Use of judgment;
- (5) Responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and
- (6) Dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

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

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 your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

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).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
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 416.920(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? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(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. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

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? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The objective medical evidence on the record indicates an August 8, 2010 physical examination indicates that claimant's blood pressure was 101/64, pulse 89, respiration is 20, temperature 97.7 degrees Fahrenheit, saturation 97% air. She was lying in bed complaining of pain in her back radiating to her legs. Interacting appropriately with the examiner. Her HEENT head was normal cephalic and atraumatic. Pupils are equal, mild and reactive to light and accommodation. Extraocular movements are intact. Tympanic membranes are normal bilaterally. Throat is nonerythematous. Mucous membranes are moist. The neck was supple with full range of motion and no adenopathy. The lungs were clear to auscultation bilaterally. No wheezes or crackles (Page 310). Cardiovascular had regular rate and rhythm without murmurs or gallops. The abdomen was soft and nontender. The extremities had no clubbing, cyanosis or edema. The skin was warm, dry and intact. No rashes or lesions. No neurological areas, cranial nerves 2 through 12 are grossly intact. In the musculoskeletal area, the patient complained of pain in her back with any movement. Upon palpation, there does appear to be some muscle spasm noted in the paraspinal muscles bilaterally in the lower back. A metabolic panel was within normal limits. Acetaminophen level was less than ten. CBC showed a white count of 10,400 hemoglobin 13.9. The impression was back pain, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease whereupon the claimant was encouraged to quit smoking by the doctor (Page 309). A November 13, 2010 physical examination indicates that claimant was alert and very truthful during the examination. She had normal color and was well hydrated, well nourished, well developed and well dressed. Appearance was that of stated age, HEENT was normal and had normal external inspection. Vital signs were normal. Eyes and pupils were equal, reactive to light. Ears were normal. Pharynx was normal. The neck had normal inspection. The neck was nontender and there is painless range of motion. Cardiovascular had normal heart sounds and the pulses were normal. She is in no respiratory distress and her breath sounds were normal. In the abdomen she had no visible injuries. It was soft and nontender. Bowel sounds were normal. No organomegaly. No mass. Femoral pulses were equal. The back had normal inspection. The patient complained of severe tenderness with palpation of the entire spine and paraspinal muscles down to the tailbone. She was able to sit up and vent for examination. Her skin was warm and dry. Normal skin color. No rash. Normal skin turgor. The extremities had no lower extremity edema. No calf tenderness. The neurological examination noted that claimant was oriented x3. Her mood and affect were normal. No motor deficits. No sensory deficits. Her reflexes were normal. She had tests to perform straight leg raising. She complained of excruciating pain as soon as the leg lifted off the bed. The

doctor discontinued prescribing her narcotics when she was advised to use Toradol and Valium. Patient complained of difficulty walking when the nurse states she saw the patient walking from the car to the wheelchair without difficulty in the parking lot. The patient was stable (Page 518). On the seven-point examination, April 2011, reported pain with range of motion in the back. She had normal coordination (Pages A29 to A30). She had intact motor and sensory deficits (Page A22). Her lungs were clear and heart within normal limits (Page A29 and A30).

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of her body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file which support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impression is that claimant is stable. There is no medical finding that claimant has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, claimant has restricted herself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon her reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges no disabling mental impairments.

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, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon her failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny her again at Step 4 based upon her ability to perform her past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which she has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the [REDACTED], published by the [REDACTED]... 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment or that she is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of her. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and she should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Claimant

has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that she has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent her from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 48), with a 12th grade education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.20. Claimant does retain the capacity to perform her pasta work as a housekeeper.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with her impairments. The department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is AFFIRMED.



Landis Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 5, 2011

Date Mailed: October 5, 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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

LYL/tg

cc:

