

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-36867  
Issue No.: 2009;4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 26, 2012  
County: Kalamazoo

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Vicki L. Armstrong

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge upon the Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due notice, an in person hearing was commenced on June 26, 2012, from Kalamazoo, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The new evidence was forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) for consideration. On September 13, 2012, the SHRT found Claimant was not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department of Human Services (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P), Retro-MA and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

**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 October 25, 2011, Claimant filed an application for MA-P and SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 14, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro-MA indicating that he was capable of performing other work, pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920(f).

- (3) On February 21, 2012, the department caseworker sent Claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On February 28, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On April 13, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant was not disabled. (Department Exhibit B, pp 1-2).
- (6) Claimant has a history of chronic lumbar degenerative disc disease, post traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, agoraphobia, osteoarthritis and radiculopathy.
- (7) Claimant is a 40 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'9" tall and weighs 131 lbs. Claimant completed high school and attended a few semesters of college.
- (8) Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

### **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 Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Current legislative amendments to the Act delineate eligibility criteria as implemented by department policy set forth in program manuals. 2004 PA 344, Sec. 604, establishes the State Disability Assistance program. It reads in part:

Sec. 604 (1). The department shall operate a state disability assistance program. Except as provided in subsection (3), persons eligible for this program shall include needy citizens of the United States or aliens

exempt from the Supplemental Security Income citizenship requirement who are at least 18 years of age or emancipated minors meeting one or more of the following requirements:

(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.

Specifically, this Act provides minimal cash assistance to individuals with some type of severe, temporary disability which prevents him or her from engaging in substantial gainful work activity for at least ninety (90) days.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, 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

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. Claimant's impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only claimant's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has an impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c). A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e). Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. 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. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment. 20 CFR 416.929(a).

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 blood pressure, x-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms). 20 CFR 416.913(b).

The law does not require an applicant to be completely symptom free before a finding of lack of disability can be rendered. In fact, if an applicant's symptoms can be managed to the point where substantial gainful activity can be achieved, a finding of not disabled must be rendered.

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

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 (e.g. 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 there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

At step one, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that he/she has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, he/she is not disabled regardless of how severe his/her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of his/her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

At step two, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p). If the claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he/she is not disabled.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work). 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C). First, an individual's pertinent symptoms, signs and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1). When a medically determinable mental impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that

substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual's significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2). Functional limitations are assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual's ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively and on a sustained basis. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(2). Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication and other treatment, and the effect on the overall degree of functionality are considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1). In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining and individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4).

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). 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 determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these 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.  
20 CFR 416.921(b).

At step three, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1

(20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

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 96-8p).

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.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), 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. If the claimant is able to do other work, he/she is not disabled. If the claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirements, he/she is disabled.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, published by the Department of Labor. 20 CFR 416.967.

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

more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the 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. 20 CFR 416.967(b). Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c). Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

At Step 1, Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since 2000. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

At Step 2, Claimant's symptoms are evaluated to see there is an underlying medically determinable physical or mental impairment(s) that could reasonably be expected to produce the claimant's pain or other symptoms. This must be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. Once an underlying physical or mental impairment(s) has been shown, the Administrative Law Judge must evaluate the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of Claimant's symptoms to determine the extent to which they limit Claimant's ability to do basic work activities. For this purpose, whenever statements about the intensity, persistence, or functionally limiting effects of pain or other symptoms are not substantiated by objective medical evidence, a finding on the credibility of the statements based on a consideration of the entire case record must be made.

In the present case, Claimant alleges disability due to chronic lumbar degenerative disc disease, post traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, agoraphobia, osteoarthritis and radiculopathy.

On November 16, 2011, Claimant saw his primary care physician complaining of anxiety and back pain. He stated his anxiety has gradually worsened. Symptoms included chest pain, compulsions, decreased concentration, depressed mood, excessive worry, hyperventilation, insomnia, irritability, nervous/anxious behavior, palpitations and restlessness. His symptoms were constant, causing significant distress and interfering with daily activities. Quality of sleep was poor. His past medical history was significant for anxiety/panic attacks. He also had chronic back pain associated with falling off a roof and getting a compression fracture which has been gradually worsening. The pain is present in the lumbar spine, described as shooting and aching. It radiates to the right thigh, right knee and right foot. The pain is severe, 9/10. Associated symptoms include chest pain, numbness, weight loss, leg pain, paresthesias, tingling and weakness. Claimant appeared distressed and was very thin. He sat



very stiffly and moved very slowly from sitting to standing. He made frequent adjustments in position while sitting. He exhibited decreased range of motion, tenderness, bony tenderness, pain and spasm in his lumbar back. Claimant was prescribed Citalopram for his depression and anxiety. Morphine and percocet were prescribed for his chronic back pain.

Claimant saw his primary care physician on November 22, 2011, complaining of back pain and depression. He reported the pain medication provided moderate relief. He complained of depressed mood, difficulty concentrating, feelings of worthlessness/guilt, insomnia and psychomotor agitation.

Claimant met with his neurosurgeon on January 23, 2012, for re-evaluation of low back pain and predominantly left lower extremity pain. He walked with an antalgic gait. Review of Claimant's lumbar spine MRI, which was performed with and without contrast on 1/20/12, showed postoperative changes status post decompressive laminectomy at L5-S1. At L4-L5, he had a new left paracentral disc herniation that was causing impingement of the left L4 nerve root. He also had some post-surgical changes and scarring around the S1 nerve root on the left side at L5-S1. Review of Claimant's lumbar MRI, which was performed with and without contrast on 1/30/11 demonstrated lumbar spondylosis with a normal imaged portion of his conus. He had degenerative disc disease from L3-L4 to L5-S1. He had postoperative changes with a decompressive laminectomy at L5-S1 without any neural element impingement at that level, but he did have some postsurgical enhancement surrounding the traversing right S1 nerve root. At L4-L5, he had a midline disc protrusion that abuts the traversing L5 nerve roots, worse on the left side than on the right side. The risks of surgery were discussed and Claimant opted for surgery with the goal of improving the left lower extremity radicular pain, but not his chronic back pain or chronic right leg pain.

On February 2, 2012, Claimant underwent a left L4-L5 discectomy. On March 12, 2012, Claimant returned for his postoperative check. He did not have any radicular left leg pain. He did have the residual right lower extremity pain, which was chronic and long-standing since his surgery. As of May 8, 2012, his left lower extremity radicular pain had improved significantly. However, he had continued chronic back pain and right lower extremity radicular pain. Claimant was depressed and also had peripheral edema.

On March 6, 2012, Claimant's physician completed a discharge of a federal student loan form on Claimant's behalf indicating Claimant had a medically determinable physical impairment that prevents him from engaging in any substantial gainful activity in any field of work which has lasted for a continuous period of not less than 60 months or could be expected to last for a continuous period of 60 months. Claimant was diagnosed with chronic lumbar degenerative disc disease and radiculopathy. The treating physician noted the disabling impairment was severe causing Claimant difficulty in ambulating and was limited to sitting and standing no more than 10 minutes, walking less than 50 feet, and

lifting no more than 5 pounds. Claimant also had difficulty cleaning his home, shopping for essentials and driving. He was able to dress and wash himself with minimal ambulation. He was experiencing depression due to the pain and limitations.

Claimant underwent a Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment on June 12, 2012, at the request of the department. Claimant was found to be markedly limited in his ability to: understand and remember one or two-step instructions; understand and remember detailed instructions; carry out detailed instructions; maintain attention and concentration for extended periods; work in coordination with or proximity to others without being distracted by them; complete a normal workday and worksheet without interruptions from psychologically based symptoms and to perform at a consistent pace without an unreasonable number and length of rest periods; accept instructions and respond appropriately to criticism from supervisors; get along with co-workers or peers without distracting them or exhibiting behavior extremes; respond appropriately to change in the work setting; travel in unfamiliar places or use public transportation and set realistic goals or make plans independently of others. The examining social worker also noted that Claimant has his mother as his current caregiver and he required constant support from his caregiver. He had also shown behavior associated with agoraphobia when in crowds of people. He also isolated himself to avoid interaction with others. He exhibited short-term memory loss and needed constant prompts from his mother to complete tasks.

On July 5, 2012, Claimant attended his medication review at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. The psychiatrist started him on Risperdal to augment the anti-depressive effect of Celexa which had been prescribed by his primary care physician. He was diagnosed with mood disorder and a history of alcohol and drug abuse, mostly marijuana.

Claimant has presented medical evidence establishing that he does have some mental and physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that Claimant has an impairment, or combination of impairments, that has more than a *de minimus* effect on Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, Claimant is not disqualified from receiving MA-P benefits at Step 2.

The analysis would next proceed to Step 3, where the medical evidence of Claimant's condition would be compared to the listings. In light of the medical evidence, listing 12.06 was considered. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant meets the listing of 12.06. There are medically documented findings of recurrent obsessions or compulsions which are a source of marked distress and these result in marked restrictions of maintaining social function and marked restriction in activities of daily living and these also result in a complete inability to function independently outside the area of Claimant's parent's home. Claimant's

mother credibly testified that the only time her son leaves his room is when he is forced to and even then he will have panic attacks. Thus, this Administrative Law Judge finds Claimant meets listing 12.06 and should be considered disabled.

Even if Claimant had not been approved at Step 3, this Administrative Law Judge would find at Step 4 that Claimant is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Claimant credibly testified that he was unable to do sheet metal work based on his back. The Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment found that Claimant's severe anxiety disorder would result in a severely impaired capacity to do work-related activities. Therefore, Claimant is found to be unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past.

Even though Claimant has been found to meet disability criteria, this Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other jobs.

At Step 5, this Administrative Law Judge must determine whether or not Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other jobs in the national economy. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does establish that Claimant would be unable to perform any other work due to the severe anxiety disorder which would result in a severely impaired ability to do work-related activities.

Claimant has presented the required competent, material and substantial evidence which would support a finding that Claimant has an impairment or combination of impairments which would significantly limit the physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(c). Therefore, Claimant is disabled for the purposes of the Medical Assistance disability (MA-P) program.

The Department has not established that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that Claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance and/or State Disability Assistance. Consequently, the department's denial of Claimant's October 25, 2011 MA/Retro-MA and SDA application cannot be upheld.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department erred in determining Claimant is not currently disabled for MA/Retro-MA and SDA eligibility purposes.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **REVERSED**, and it is ORDERED that:

1. The department shall process Claimant's October 25, 2011 MA/Retro-MA and SDA application, and shall award him all the

benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.

2. The department shall review Claimant's medical condition for improvement in October, 2013, unless his Social Security Administration disability status is approved by that time.
3. The department shall obtain updated medical evidence from Claimant's treating physicians, physical therapists, pain clinic notes, etc. regarding his continued treatment, progress and prognosis at review.

/s/  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: October 8, 2012

Date Mailed: October 9, 2012

**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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

VLA/las

cc:



