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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-25809

Issue No.: 2009

Case No.:

Hearing Date: April 9, 2012 County: Wayne (82-82)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, MCL 400.37 and Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on April 9, 2012, in Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant, Claimant's husband, Authorized Hearing Representative,

Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

<u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department correctly determine that Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA or Medicaid) program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on competent, material and substantial evidence in the record and on the entire record as a whole, finds as material fact:

- 1. On July 8, 2011, Claimant filed an application for MA benefits. The application also requested MA retroactive to April 1, 2011.
- 2. On October 10, 2011, a Notice of Case Action was sent to Claimant advising her that the application was denied.
- 3. On January 6, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request appealing the Department's denial.
- 4. Claimant, age forty-four has a high-school education.

- 5. Claimant last worked in 2008 as a receptionist. Claimant also performed relevant work as a bus driver, an optical lensmaker, and a packer in a warehouse. Claimant's relevant work history consists exclusively of unskilled work activities requiring medium exertional effort.
- 6. Claimant has a history of deep vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, diabetes, hypertension, diabetic neuropathy affecting the right leg, mild pulmonary insufficiency, and left hip and lower back pain. Her onset date is had her first pulmonary embolism and a blood clot in her leg.
- 7. Claimant was hospitalized , as a result of deep vein thrombosis and acute dyspnea of unclear etiology.
- 8. Claimant currently suffers from deep vein thrombosis, pulmonary embolism, diabetes, hypertension, diabetic neuropathy affecting the right leg, mild pulmonary insufficiency, and left hip and lower back pain.
- 9. Claimant has severe limitations of her ability to sit, stand, lift and carry, walk, drive, and use her hands and arms. Claimant's limitations have lasted or are expected to last twelve months or more.
- 10. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning her impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the whole record, reflect an individual who is so impaired as to be incapable of engaging in any substantial gainful activity on a regular and continuing basis.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

MA was established by Title XIX of the U.S. Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department administers MA pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and Reference Tables (RFT).

SDA provides financial assistance for disabled persons and was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers SDA pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM and RFT.

The Administrative Law Judge concludes that Claimant \boxtimes **IS DISABLED** for purposes of the MA program, for the following reason (select ONE):

State the Impairment Listing No.:

9.08-Diabetes Mellitus with:

Α.

requirements.

Neuropathy

3. Claimant is capable of performing previous relevant work.

and de 11.00C	ties resulting in sustained disturbance of gross exterous movements, or gait and station (see b. Appendix 1, 20 CFR, Subpart P, Listing of ment 9.08A.
☐ 2 Claimant is not capat	ole of performing other work.
The Administrative Law Ju DISABLED for the following	dge concludes and determines that Claimant IS NOT reason (select ONE):
☐ 1. Claimant is engaged	in substantial gainful activity.

2. Claimant's impairment(s) do not meet the severity and one-year duration

demonstrated

persistent disorganization of motor function in two

by

significant

4. Claimant is capable of performing other work. In addition, Claimant gave credible and unrebutted testimony that her primary care told Claimant that she had diabetic neuropathy. This physician, diagnosis may also be indicated on the right foot MRI examination. Claimant's right leg and left arm and hand require braces. She experiences hand and leg spasms and neuropathy symptoms in all four extremities. She has fatigue, sleep difficulty, difficulty walking, sitting, standing, and lifting and carrying more than two gallons of milk. She does not engage in housework and her family helps her out. She uses a motorized cart at the grocery store. She experiences numbness from her ankle to toe of her right foot. Because of the problems with her right foot, she has not driven in some time. She is in chronic pain and takes prescription medication for diabetes, high blood pressure, breathing, pain, spasms, nerves, and depression. has not specifically restricted Claimant from working, but she has advised Claimant just to try and do more around the house.

It is found and concluded that Claimant's testimony, the medical records, and all of the evidence in this case taken as a whole, support a conclusion that Claimant is disabled within the meaning of the federal Listing of Impairment 9.08-Diabetes mellitus. Claimant has only nominal use of her extremities, her gait and carrying strength are limited, and she experiences neuropathy in her extremities accompanied by muscle spasms. This constitutes significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in two extremities, as specified in Listing of Impairment 9.08A. This impairment further constitutes sustained disturbance of gross and dexterous movements, and disturbances in her gait and station, within the meaning of Listing 9.08A.

In conclusion Claimant is f	n, based on ound to be	the Fi	ndings o	f Fact ar	nd Coi	nclusions	of Law	above,	the
□ DISABL	ED	□ No	OT DISAE	BLED					
for purposes of the MA program. The Department's denial of MA benefits to Claimant is									
	ED	⊠ RE	VERSED)					
this decision physical or r 90 days. Re RSDI benefi as disabled to eligibility critical physical control of the statement of	ant did not apple. In order to be mental impairmed to be to	ne disa ent whenefits disab the S in BEN	abled for hich mee based up bility or black DA program 261. In	purposes ts federal oon disabi indness) am. Othe asmuch a	of SD SSI d ility or autom er spec as Clair	A, the indisability solindness atically quific financement has	dividual ratandards (or receualifies acial and robeen foundaries)	must have for at leading to the second terms of the second terms o	ve a east SI or dual ncial bled
		<u>D</u>	<u>ECISION</u>	AND OR	DER				
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, and for the reasons stated on the record finds that Claimant									
	☐ do	es no	t meet						
the definition 2007.	of medically o	lisable	ed under t	he Medic	al Assi	stance as	s of the o	nset dat	te of
The Departn	nent's decision	is	_ AFF	IRMED		REVERS	ED		
_	PARTMENT I TE OF MAILIN						G WITHI	N 10 D	AYS
eligibi 2. If all others benef Claim 3. If all others	e processing lity criteria for land nonmedical elimination to Claiman ant is entitled in nonmedical elimination for review of the land nonmedical elimination for the land nonmedical elimination elimin	MA an gibility or ber ht, income according gibility r bene	d MA retronder contents, initional contents, initional contents and co	oactive be for benef tiate prod ny supple vith policy for benef ate proced	enefits its hav cessing ements ; its hav dures t	have been of MA s for lose	en met; met and and MA it benefit met and ile a rede	Claimar retroad ts to w Claimar etermina	nt is ctive hich nt is ation

4. All steps shall be taken in accordance with Department policy and procedure.

Jan Leventer
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 17, 2012

Date Mailed: April 17, 2012

<u>MOTICE</u>: 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 <u>MAY</u> 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

JL/pf

cc: