

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-46633  
Issue No: 2009

[REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** [REDACTED]

**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 [REDACTED]. The claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. The claimant appeared and provided testimony. [REDACTED] appeared and provided testimony on behalf of the department.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) 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 [REDACTED], claimant applied for MA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS).
2. Claimant applied for retro MA.
3. On [REDACTED], the MRT denied.
4. On [REDACTED] the DHS issued notice.
5. On [REDACTED], 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 [REDACTED], the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant. Pursuant to the claimant's request to hold the record open for the submission of new and additional medical documentation, on [REDACTED] SHRT once again denied claimant.
8. As of the date of hearing, claimant was a [REDACTED] standing 6'0" tall and weighing 237 pounds. Claimant has a high school education.
9. Claimant testified that he does not smoke cigarettes, drink alcohol or abuse any drugs.
10. Claimant has a driver's license and can drive an automobile, although not for long distances.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in [REDACTED] performing maintenance; where he greased and oiled machines, changed the oil and ran the floor scrubber for [REDACTED]. Claimant was laid off in [REDACTED]. Claimant is currently attending a work assist program in the area of heating and cooling.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of back and knee pain and memory problems.
13. On [REDACTED] claimant underwent a left sided L4-5, L5-S1 discectomy, using pedicle screws, posterior lumbar interbody fusion with utilization of bone morphogenic protein.
14. On [REDACTED], the claimant underwent a partial lateral meniscectomy with chondroplasty of the patella, medial tibial plateau, lateral femoral condyle, lateral tibial plateau and medial femoral condyle, right knee.
15. On [REDACTED] claimant was admitted into the hospital with confusion and a temperature of 102 degrees. The medical team suspected viral encephalitis. Neuropsychological evaluation did reveal moderate, persistent cognitive deficits. He did not appear delirious, but he was extremely lethargic which affected his overall performance and made it difficult to determine if the results were primarily related to lethargy or perhaps related to underlying cognitive dysfunction. The client's mental status gradually improved during his stay in the hospital. The claimant was discharged on [REDACTED].
16. An [REDACTED] psychological exam found the client to be perceptually oriented and able to present his ideas in a logical coherent fashion. His speech was readily understandable with no impediments, but there was a tendency to ramble with a need to be re-directed. He was able to self-disclose regarding his psychiatric, substance abuse and legal histories

and was an adequate historian. His demonstrated affect was largely within normal limits, but characterized by underlying depression and frustration secondary to medical issues. The current diagnostic impression for the client was reactive depression and anxiety secondary to medical stressors, a history of alcoholism, a history of closed head injury and encephalitis with ongoing headaches and balance problems, chronic back problems and history of back and knee surgery and history of blood clot. The claimant was assigned a Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) of 50. It was also recommended that the client be re-involved in outpatient psychiatric treatment designed to reduce psychiatric symptoms, stabilize daily functioning and address any substance abuse issues.

17. On [REDACTED] the claimant underwent an independent physical examination. His chief complaints were viral encephalopathy, post lumbar laminectomy - fusion x2 and a recent surgery on his right knee. Physical examination of the client's central nervous system found he was grossly within normal limits, except that he is weak. The client walked with the aide of a cane for balance. He was found to still be recovering from knee surgery in the right knee. He was also still found to be having trouble focusing with his eye muscles because of the viral encephalopathy.
18. On [REDACTED] claimant underwent another independent medical examination. The client reported that since his hospitalization with viral meningitis, he had problems with his balance. Examination found the client did not walk with an appreciable limp, but did walk with a rather small stepped, wide based gait. He did use a cane for ambulation, but was able to ambulate without the use of his cane. Examination of the extremities and musculoskeletal system found no obvious bony deformities. Range of motion of all joints checked was full and there was no tenderness, erythema or effusion of any joint. Straight leg raising test was negative and there was no paravertebral muscle spasm. Peripheral pulses were easily palpated and symmetrical and there was no edema. There was no evidence of varicose veins. His grip strength was intact and his hands had full dexterity. The client had mild difficulty getting on and off the examination table. His motor strength was 5/5. His sensation remained intact. His reflexes were present and symmetrical. He was alert and oriented x3. Cranial nerves 2 through 12 were grossly intact.
19. [REDACTED] MRI of the cervical spine found mild to moderate herniated disk at the level of C6 to C7 extending in the neural foramen on the right side and cervical spondylotic changes at the levels of C5 to C6, C4 to C5 and C3 to C4 causing moderate spinal canal narrowing especially at the levels of C3 to C4 and C5 to C6 with narrowing of the neural foramina.

20. A [REDACTED] medical examination report found the client had moderate memory deficits. The claimant's condition was found to be limited. The claimant's physician opined that he could only frequently lift less than 10 pounds and occasionally lift up to 20 pounds. The claimant should stand and/or walk less than 2 hours in an 8 hour work day and sit less than 6 hours in an 8 hour work day. The client should be able to use his hands and arms for simple grasping and reaching, but not for pushing and pulling. The client would also be able to use both feet and legs for operating foot or leg controls. The client was rated as limited in memory and sustained concentration.

### **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).

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. After reviewing the medical evidence of record, the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of unskilled, sedentary work.

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 cannot return to past relevant work on the basis of the medical evidence. The analysis continues.

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 sedentary 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 sedentary work. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (ages 45 – 49) with a high school education or more and a semi-skilled work history, who can perform at least sedentary work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical-Vocational Rule 201.21.

The 6<sup>th</sup> 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 (6<sup>th</sup> 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/* \_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Mailed: \_\_\_\_\_

**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

cc: \_\_\_\_\_  
MAHS