

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-7321  
Issue No: 2009; 4031

[REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Janice G. Spodarek

**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, a telephone hearing was held.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 and SDA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS).
2. Claimant did not apply 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. On [REDACTED] the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant for insufficient information. At the administrative hearing, the record was held open for the County to schedule claimant for an independent consultative physical examination by an internist as well as a psychiatric examination requested by SHRT. The undersigned ALJ has attempted repeatedly to get the department to cooperate in this case and

submit new medical documentation. The department has repeatedly failed to comply with the Interim Order and respond to the undersigned ALJ as well as the ALJ's supervisor. The procedural history is as follows:

a. [REDACTED] administrative hearing held. The record was held open at that time to obtain evaluations requested by SHRT who denied claimant on [REDACTED] r [REDACTED] due to insufficient information. The county agreed and [REDACTED] FIM and [REDACTED], ES Worker agreed to be in charge of scheduling claimant for the evaluations.

b. [REDACTED], a communication was sent to the DHS Policy Unit identifying this case as a record extension still waiting for compliance by the local office with regards to new medical documentation and an Interim Order. The Policy Unit failed to respond.

c. On [REDACTED], MAHS again requested that the DHS Policy Unit respond regarding this case. No response.

d. On [REDACTED], the DHS Policy Unit was once again sent a communication requesting assistance as the local office had continued to fail to respond. No response from the DHS Policy Unit.

e. On [REDACTED], Administrative Law Manager [REDACTED] personally requested assistance of a Policy Analyst with the Michigan DHS regarding this case stating:

[REDACTED]

responded to the second case, but not to the case at issue herein.

7. On [REDACTED] the undersigned ALJ received an updated SOLQ verification indicating that claimant was denied SSI pursuant to an application of [REDACTED].

8. As of the date of application, claimant was a [REDACTED] standing 5'8" tall and weighing 213 pounds. Claimant is classified as obese under the Body Mass Index (BMI) at 32.4.

9. Claimant testified at the hearing that he did not currently have any alcohol/drug abuse problems. Claimant has had two DUI's in the past. Claimant smokes and has a nicotine addiction.
10. Claimant does not have a driver's license.
11. Claimant has a Bachelor's Degree.
12. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant's medical file indicates that he has stated: [REDACTED] Exhibit 28. Exhibit 17. Claimant's work history is semi-skilled.
13. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of asthma and depression.
14. The [REDACTED] SHRT findings and conclusions of its decision are adopted and incorporated by reference herein/to the following extent:

Mental status exams from [REDACTED] indicates functioning adequately with therapy and medication with normal limit evaluations. At the [REDACTED] review, claimant was reported to be in need of constant supervision and needing assistance in everyday functions. Exhibits 42-43. Claimants involuntarily admit in [REDACTED] states in part that claimant indicated that he was just talking [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Exhibit 28.
15. Claimant testified at the hearing that he does not need any assistance with his activities of daily living. Claimant is capable of preparing a sandwich, dusting, washing dishes, laundry, bathroom and grooming needs.

### **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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services

(DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Statutory authority for the SDA program states in part:

- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

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.

Prior to any substantive review, jurisdiction is paramount. Applicable to the case herein, policy states:

#### **Final SSI Disability Determination**

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
  - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**
  - .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. PEM, Item 260, pp 2-3.

Relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until the determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(i). These regulations further provide: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the agency." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(ii).

In this case, there is apparently no dispute relative to the facts. Claimant's claim was considered by SSA and benefits denied. The determination was final. Claimant is alleging the same impairments. None of the exceptions apply.

For these reasons, under the above-cited policy and federal law, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction to proceed with a substantive review. The department's denial must be upheld.

In the alternative, the sequential analysis will be applied as follows below:

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).

It is noted that Congress removed obesity from the Listing of Impairments shortly after the removal of drug addition and alcoholism. This removal reflects the view that there is a strong behavioral component to obesity. Thus, obesity in-and-of itself is not sufficient to show statutory disability.

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. With regards to claimant's alleged physical problems, claimant alleges asthma. However, claimant is a smoker. Moreover, there is no medical evidence to indicate that the asthma interferes with claimant's ability to engage in work or work like settings. Thus, this ALJ finds that the asthma is not severe as defined under federal and state law. Thus, the analysis will continue with regards to claimant's alleged mental impairment(s) only.

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.

The fourth step of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by claimant in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

As noted in the findings of facts, claimant's work history is production and also is working as a staff assistant for a non-profit organization. After careful review of the substantial and credible evidence on the whole record, this ALJ finds that claimant can return to past relevant work at step four of the analysis. In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that claimant's testimony and documentation disputes severity with regards to his mental health issue(s). Claimant's statements were in part [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In addition, claimant's testimony at the administrative hearing is that he is independent with activities of daily living, capable of engaging in bathroom and grooming needs, household work including dusting, washing dishes, laundry and meal preparation. Statutory disability is not shown. 20 CFR 416.928, .927 and .912.

It is noted in the alternative that should the sequential analysis continue, at the first step of the analysis pursuant to the considerations at Medical Vocational Grid Rule 204.00 footnote as a guide, a finding of not disabled would be required.

**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/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Janice G. Spodarek  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: [REDACTED]

**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.

2011-7321/JGS

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.

JGS/jk

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the majority of the text in the 'cc:' field. The only visible text is 'MAHS' at the bottom left of the redacted area.

MAHS