

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2011-50348  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: December 5, 2011  
Wayne County DHS (82)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Colleen M. Mamelka

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held in Detroit, Michigan on Monday, December 5, 2011. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED] and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department"). [REDACTED] observed the proceedings.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") benefit 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. The Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits on May 11, 2011.
2. On June 28, 2011, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") determined the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program. (Exhibit 1, pp. 3, 4)
3. The Department sent an Eligibility Notice to the Claimant informing him of the MRT determination.

4. On August 17, 2011, the Department received the Claimant's timely written Request for Hearing. (Exhibit 3)
5. On October 4, 2011, the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") determined that the Claimant was not disabled. (Exhibit 4)
6. The Claimant's alleged physical disabling impairment(s) are due to back, shoulder, knee, and feet, pain, compression fracture, extremity weakness, headaches, and seizure disorder.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to depression and anxiety.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was [REDACTED] years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 6'1" in height; and weighed 190 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some college and vocational training as an electrician.
10. The Claimant's employment history consists of work in a warehouse, as a prep cook, an apprentice electrician, hi-lo driver, and at a tire store.
11. The Claimant's impairment(s) have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services, formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, 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 Tables ("RFT").

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). The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make

appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a). Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicant takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3). The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2).

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1). The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945.

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a). An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The individual has the responsibility to

provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity therefore is not ineligible for disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b). Examples 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.

*Id.*

The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985).

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to back, shoulder, knee, and feet, pain, compression fracture, extremity weakness, headaches, seizure disorder, depression, and anxiety.

On [REDACTED], a Psychiatric/Psychological Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The diagnoses were bipolar disorder (most recent episode, depressed) severe and alcohol abuse. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 50. The Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment was also completed which found the Claimant markedly limited in 3 of the factors and moderately limited in 8 factors.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant presented to the hospital with full-blown DTs. The Claimant underwent an open reduction internal fixation ("ORIF") for his left shoulder fracture. A CT showed a spinal compression fracture. The Claimant was discharged on February 16<sup>th</sup> with the diagnoses of status post acute respiratory failure, full-blown alcohol withdrawal with seizures, polysubstance abuse, normocytic anemia, alcoholic liver disease, left shoulder dislocation, left humeral neck fracture, and thoracic spine compression fracture.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant presented to the hospital with lower extremity pain and the inability to walk. An MRI confirmed lower extremity weakness with pain, paresthesia, and thoracic spine compression fractures. The Claimant was treated and discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of subacute fracture, depression, and leg weakness.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were shoulder fracture, thoracic spine compression fracture, and bilateral lower extremity weakness. The physical examination revealed right arm weakness, pain, and bilateral lower extremity weakness. The Claimant was in a wheelchair and restricted to less than sedentary activity.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant sought treatment for low back pain and loss of control of his legs. X-rays showed fractures in the thoracic spine without compression. An EMG was ordered to determine the possible cause of nerve damage resulting in the bilateral loss of control of the lower extremities. The Claimant required attendant care and replacement services.

On [REDACTED], an x-ray revealed severe compression deformity of T7-8 and mild compression deformity of T10 vertebra.

On this same date, the Claimant attended a follow-up treatment for his low back pain and loss of control of his legs.

On [REDACTED] a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were fracture in the thoracic area with possible nerve damage in the lower extremities. The Claimant was unable to care for himself noting instability of bilateral lower extremities weakness. The Claimant needed daily attendant care and replacement services.

On [REDACTED], a Medical Examination Report was completed on behalf of the Claimant. The current diagnoses were T8 – 10 compression fracture and unknown etiology of lower extremity weakness. The Claimant was unable to care for himself and was unable to ambulate, requiring a wheelchair. The Claimant's condition was deteriorating and he was restricted to less than sedentary activity.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, the Claimant has presented medical evidence establishing that he does have physical and mental limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that the Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimus* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for twelve months; therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. The Claimant has alleged disabling impairments due to back, shoulder, knee, and feet, pain, compression fracture, extremity weakness, headaches, seizure disorder, anxiety, and depression.

Listing 1.00 defines musculoskeletal system impairments. Disorders of the musculoskeletal system may result from hereditary, congenital, or acquired pathologic processes. 1.00A. Impairments may result from infectious, inflammatory, or degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events, or neoplastic, vascular, or toxic/metabolic diseases. 1.00A. Regardless of the cause(s) of a musculoskeletal impairment, functional loss for purposes of these listings is defined as the inability to ambulate effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment, or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment. Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that interferes very

seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. 1.00B2b(1). Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity function to permit independent ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s) that limits the functioning of both upper extremities. (Listing 1.05C is an exception to this general definition because the individual has the use of only one upper extremity due to amputation of a hand.) *Id.* To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to be able to carry out activities of daily living. 1.00B2b(2). They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. . . . *Id.* When an individual's impairment involves a lower extremity uses a hand-held assistive device, such as a cane, crutch or walker, the medical basis for use of the device should be documented. 1.00J4. The requirement to use a hand-held assistive device may also impact an individual's functional capacity by virtue of the fact that one or both upper extremities are not available for such activities as lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling. *Id.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

- 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint(s) due to any cause: Characterized by gross anatomical deformity (e.g. subluxation, contracture, bony or fibrous ankylosis, instability) and chronic joint pain and stiffness with signs of limitation of motion or other abnormal motion of the affected joint(s), and findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging of joint space narrowing, bony destruction, or ankylosis of the affected joint(s). With:
- A. Involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively as defined in 1.00B2b; or
  - B. Involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, wrist, hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively as defined in 1.00B2c.

\* \* \*

- 1.04 Disorders of the spine (e.g., herniated nucleus pulposus, spinal arachnoiditis, spinal stenosis, osteoarthritis, degenerative disc disease, facet arthritis, vertebral fracture), resulting in compromise of a nerve root (including the cauda equine) or spinal cord. With:
- A. Evidence of nerve root compression characterized by neuro-anatomic distribution of pain, limitation of motion of the spine, motor loss (atrophy with

- associated muscle weakness or muscle weakness) accompanied by sensory or reflex loss and, if there is involvement of the lower back, positive straight-leg raising test (sitting and supine); or
- B. Spinal arachnoiditis, confirmed by an operative note or pathology report of tissue biopsy, or by appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by severe burning or painful dysesthesia, resulting in the need for changes in position or posture more than once every 2 hours; or
- C. Lumbar spinal stenosis resulting in pseudoclaudication, established by findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by chronic nonradicular pain and weakness, and resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b. (see above definition)

In this case, the objective evidence establishes that the Claimant has severe T8-10 compression fractures and lower extremity weakness such that the Claimant is unable to stand and/or walk. The Claimant is wheelchair bound and requires assistance with his activities of daily living. Additionally, the Claimant suffers from weakness and reduced range of motion of his left upper extremity, status post ORIF of the shoulder. The Claimant is restricted to less than sedentary activity. Ultimately, as detailed above, the Claimant's impairments meet, or are the medical equivalent thereof, a listed impairment within Listing 1.00. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate processing of the May 11, 2011 application, retroactive to February 2011, to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant and his Authorized Representative of the determination in accordance with department policy.

3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.
4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in January 2013 in accordance with department policy.

*Colleen M. Mamelka*

**Colleen M. Mamelka**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 8, 2011

Date Mailed: December 8, 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

10011-50348/CMM

CMM/cl

cc:

