

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201277460  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 4, 2013  
County: Wayne DHS (41)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 4, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named claimant. [REDACTED] testified on behalf of Claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Specialist.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) on the basis that Claimant is not a disabled individual.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On 4/26/12, Claimant applied for MA benefits including retroactive MA benefits from 1/2012-3/2012.
2. Claimant's only basis for MA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On 7/25/12, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 5-6).
4. On 7/30/12, DHS denied Claimant's application for MA benefits and mailed a Medicaid Program Eligibility Notice (Exhibits 3-4) informing Claimant of the denial.

5. On 9/17/12 Claimant requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA benefits (see Exhibit 2).
6. On 10/22/12, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 36-37), in part, by application of Medical-Vocational Rule 202.20.
7. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a [REDACTED] year old male with a height of 5'7" and weight of 225 pounds.
8. Claimant has a history of tobacco abuse.
9. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 7<sup>th</sup> grade.
10. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant had no medical coverage.
11. Claimant alleged that he is disabled based on impairments and issues including: headaches, carpal-tunnel syndrome, loss of vision and left hand dysfunction related to a stroke.

### **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). DHS (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) 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 Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

MA provides medical assistance to individuals and families who meet financial and nonfinancial eligibility factors. The goal of the MA program is to ensure that essential health care services are made available to those who otherwise would not have financial resources to purchase them.

The Medicaid program is comprised of several sub-programs which fall under one of two categories; one category is FIP-related and the second category is SSI-related. BEM 105 at 1. To receive MA under an SSI-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled. *Id.* Families with dependent children, caretaker relatives of dependent children, persons under age 21 and pregnant, or recently pregnant, women receive MA under FIP-related categories. *Id.* AMP is an MA program available to persons not eligible for Medicaid through the SSI-related or FIP-related categories though DHS does always offer the program to applicants. It was not disputed that Claimant's only potential category for Medicaid eligibility would be as a disabled individual.

Disability for purposes of MA benefits is established if one of the following circumstances applies (see BEM 260 at 1-2):

- by death (for the month of death);
- the applicant receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits;
- SSI benefits were recently terminated due to financial factors;
- the applicant receives Retirement Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) on the basis of being disabled; or
- RSDI eligibility is established following denial of the MA benefit application (under certain circumstances).

There was no evidence that any of the above circumstances apply to Claimant. Accordingly, Claimant may not be considered for Medicaid eligibility without undergoing a medical review process which determines whether Claimant is a disabled individual. *Id.* at 2.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of SSI disability as found in the federal regulations. 42 CFR 435.540(a). Disability is federally defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity (SGA) 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 functionally identical definition of disability is found under DHS regulations. BEM 260 at 8.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does the following:

- Performs significant duties, and
- Does them for a reasonable length of time, and
- Does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id.* at 9.

Significant duties are duties used to do a job or run a business. *Id.* They must also have a degree of economic value. *Id.* The ability to run a household or take care of oneself does not, on its own, constitute substantial gainful activity. *Id.*

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish a disability 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).

Federal regulations describe a sequential five step process that is to be followed in determining whether a person is disabled. 20 CFR 416.920. If there is no finding of disability or lack of disability at each step, the process moves to the next step. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4).

The first step in the process considers a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The monthly amount depends on whether a person is statutorily blind or not. The 2012 income limit is \$1010/month.

In the present case, Claimant denied having any employment since the date of the MA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Claimant's testimony. Without ongoing employment, it can only be concluded that Claimant is not performing SGA. It is found that Claimant is not performing SGA; accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step two.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the 12 month duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(ii). The impairments may be combined to meet the severity requirement. If a severe impairment is not found, then a person is deemed not disabled. *Id.*

The impairments must significantly limit a person's basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(5)(c). "Basic work activities" refers to the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. *Id.* Examples of basic work activities include:

- physical functions (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling)
- capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking, understanding; carrying out, and remembering simple instructions
- use of judgment
- responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and/or
- dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a de minimus standard upon claimants to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988). Similarly, Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been interpreted so that a claim may be denied at step two for lack of a severe impairment only when the medical evidence establishes a slight abnormality or combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work even if the individual's age, education, or work experience were specifically considered. *Barrientos v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 1, 2 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirement is intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1986).

SSA specifically notes that age, education, and work experience are not considered at the second step of the disability analysis. 20 CFR 416.920 (5)(c). In determining whether Claimant's impairments amount to a severe impairment, all other relevant

evidence may be considered. The analysis will begin with the relevant submitted medical documentation.

A Medical- Social Questionnaire (Exhibits 9-10) dated 3/9/12 was presented. Claimant's only noted hospitalization from the prior 5 years was from 11/2011 due to a left knee injury.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 11-26) were presented. A hospitalization from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was noted. It was noted that Claimant presented with complaints of left-side weakness, difficulty walking and slurred speech. Claimant's blood pressure was noted as high (188/103). It was noted that a CT scan led to Claimant's admission for stroke. Final diagnoses included: acute cerebrovascular accident with left hemiparesis, uncontrolled severe acute hypertension, severe obesity, chronic smoking, hyperlipidemia and chronic neglect of health. It was noted that Claimant had a previous gunshot injury to his chest and heart. It was noted that Claimant was a pack per day smoker and occasional drinker.

A complaint of breathing difficulties led to radiology of Claimant's chest (see Exhibit 21) on [REDACTED]. The radiology verified that Claimant was previously shot but no other abnormalities were noted.

A complaint of headaches led to a CT of Claimant's head (see Exhibit 22) on [REDACTED]. No abnormal findings were noted.

A consultative examination report (Exhibits 27-35) dated [REDACTED] was presented. Claimant reported difficulties with standing, stooping, squatting, lifting, bending, reaching and climbing stairs. It was noted that Claimant reported that he uses a cane, but forgot to bring it to the exam. The examining physician noted that Claimant showed left-side weakness which was noted as "minimal". Claimant was noted to be positive for obesity. Claimant was found with 4/5 strength on the left and 5/5 on the right. It was noted that Claimant's gait and stance were normal. It was noted that Claimant performed tandem walk, heel walk and tow walk slowly. It was noted that Claimant had restricted range of motion in squatting and bending. Claimant's blood pressure was noted as high (140/110) and poorly controlled.

The evidence established that Claimant suffered a stroke in 3/2012 and still had "minimal" left-side weakness as of 6/2012. Claimant's Jamar grip strengths of 60 (right) and 45 (left) are known to be relatively low. Claimant's ambulation was noted as slow by the consultative examiner in multiple tests. Claimant's left-sided weakness and slow ambulation is sufficient to meet the de minimus standard for establishing a significant impairment to performing basic work activities.

There was no evidence that Claimant's ambulation or strength has improved or deteriorated since the 3/2012 stroke. It is known that Claimant lost approximately 50 pounds since the stroke but has not obtained any medical treatment or therapy. Based

on the nature of the impairments and lack of medical coverage, it is probable that Claimant's impairments will continue for 12 months or longer.

As it was found that Claimant established significant impairment to basic work activities for a period longer than 12 months, it is found that Claimant established having a severe impairment. Accordingly, the disability analysis may move to step three.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires a determination whether the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If Claimant's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the 12 month requirement, then the claimant is deemed disabled. If the impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Claimant's most prominent impairment appears to be stroke-related weakness. Neurological impairments are found under Listing 11.00. The most applicable listing for Claimant would be central nervous system vascular accident (Listing 11.04) which reads:

- 11.04 Central nervous system vascular accident.** With one of the following more than 3 months post-vascular accident:
- A. Sensory or motor aphasia resulting in ineffective speech or communication; or
  - B. Significant and persistent disorganization of motor function in two extremities, resulting in sustained disturbance of gross and dexterous movements, or gait and station (see 11.00C).

The presented consultative examination report is the only medical evidence of Claimant's abilities following his stroke. Claimant's speech and communication appears to be unaffected by the stroke. Claimant's mild left-side weakness and slow ambulation was noted by the consultative examiner. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Claimant has significant disorganization of motor function. It is found that Claimant does not meet the listing for central nervous system vascular accidents.

A listing of visual acuity (Listing 2.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaint of vision loss. A listing for joint dysfunction was considered based on Claimant's complaint of carpal-tunnel syndrome. Both listings were summarily rejected due to a lack of medical evidence.

It is found that Claimant failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves to step four.

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (RFC) and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if it is determined that a claimant can perform past relevant work. *Id.*

Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1). Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

Claimant testified that he worked for 20+ years as a mechanic. Claimant testified that he could no longer perform his duties because he is unable to grip tools. Claimant also stated that he gets dizzy. For purposes of this decision, Claimant's testimony will be accepted as supported by the medical evidence. It is found that Claimant cannot perform his past relevant employment and the analysis may proceed to step five.

In the fifth step in the process, the individual's RFC in conjunction with his or her age, education, and work experience, are considered to determine whether the individual can engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. SSR 83-10. While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983).

To determine the physical demands (i.e. exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967. The definitions for each are listed below.

Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a). 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. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met.

Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though 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. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.*

Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c). An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.*

Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.*

Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e). An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). Examples of non-exertional limitations include difficulty functioning due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (i.e. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i)-(vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2)

The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.* In using the rules of Appendix 2, an individual's circumstances, as indicated by the findings with respect to RFC, age, education, and work experience, is compared to the pertinent rule(s).

For purposes of this decision, only a consideration of sedentary employment will be considered. Though Claimant has a diminished left-side strength, it is only mildly diminished (4/5 per the consultative examiner). This evidence would allow Claimant to perform the lifting necessary for sedentary employment.

It was also noted that Claimant walks slowly. There is no evidence that Claimant has a need for an assistance walking device, despite Claimant's testimony that he needs a cane. It is found that Claimant is capable of performing the walking and standing necessary for sedentary employment.

Claimant testified that he has headaches and his vision is deteriorating. Claimant's vision could theoretically be resolved by eyeglasses. Claimant testified that he drove to the hearing. The examiner made no mention of vision problems in the consultative



report. Claimant also complained of headaches. There is simply insufficient medical evidence to presume that headaches or a loss of vision preclude Claimant from performing sedentary employment. It should be noted that Claimant requested vision testing, prior to a disability determination, however, the request was denied based on the lack of evidence to justify the testing.

Based on Claimant's exertional work level (sedentary), age (younger individual aged 45-49), education (high school), employment history (skilled but not transferrable), Medical-Vocational Rule 201.21 is found to apply. This rule dictates a finding that Claimant is not disabled. Accordingly, it is found that DHS properly found Claimant to be not disabled for purposes of MA benefits.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS properly denied Claimant's MA benefit application dated 4/26/12 based on a determination that Claimant is not disabled. The actions taken by DHS are AFFIRMED.



Christian Gardocki  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 11, 2013

Date Mailed: February 11, 2013

**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.

201277460/CG

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

CG/hw

cc:

