

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg No.: 2012-37115
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 5, 2012
Macomb County DHS (36)

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 Sterling Heights, Michigan on Thursday, July 5, 2012. The Claimant appeared, along with [REDACTED] and testified. The Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. Participating on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department") was [REDACTED].

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 on 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, retroactive to May 2011, on August 9, 2011. (Exhibit 2)
2. On October 12, 2011, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 1, pp. 1, 2)
3. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
4. On February 22, 2012, the Department received the Claimant's written request for hearing.

5. On April 23, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (“SHRT”) found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit 4)
6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to shortness of breath, congestive heart failure, diarrhea, seizure disorder, headaches, and brain damage.
7. The Claimant alleged mental disabling impairments due to anxiety and depression.
8. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was [REDACTED] years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5’7” in height; and weighed 200 pounds.
9. The Claimant is a high school graduate with some vocational training and an employment history as bar owner.

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 Bridge 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 416.913. 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 416.945(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).

In addition to the above, when evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is utilized. 20 CFR 416.920a(a). 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 limitation(s) is 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. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(2). Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication, and other treatment and the effect on the overall degree of functionality is 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 an individual's degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(3). The degree of limitation for the first three functional areas is rated by a five point scale: none, mild, moderate, marked, and extreme. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4). A four point scale (none, one or two, three, four or more) is used to rate the degree of limitation in the fourth functional area. *Id.* The last point on each scale represents a degree of limitation that is incompatible with the ability to do any gainful activity. *Id.*

After the degree of functional limitation is determined, the severity of the mental impairment is determined. 20 CFR 416.920a(d). If severe, a determination of whether the impairment meets or is the equivalent of a listed mental disorder is made. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(2). If the severe mental impairment does not meet (or equal) a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed. 20 CFR 416.920a(d)(3).

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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(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 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 416.921(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 shortness of breath, congestive heart failure, diarrhea, seizure disorder, headaches, brain damage, depression, and anxiety.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant attended a consultative evaluation. The diagnoses were questionable history of seizures and right shoulder pain (possibly sprain). The Internist opined that the Claimant's main problem was her severe depression and she may be able to work on a part-time basis.

On this same date, the Claimant attended a psychiatric evaluation. The Claimant was irritable, impulsive, with an unstable mood associated with cognitive symptoms. The diagnoses were bipolar disorder, alcohol dependence, cannabis dependence, and borderline personality traits. The Global Assessment Functioning ("GAF") was 35 and the prognosis was guarded.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was admitted to the hospital after falling down a flight of stairs while intoxicated. The Claimant was to transfer to inpatient psychiatry once medically stable based on her significant depression with suicidal ideations. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of major depression and chronic alcohol abuse with withdrawal.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was admitted to hospital under psychiatric care with behaviors that were "extremely dangerous to her survival." The Claimant's history of alcohol/drug abuse was documented. The Claimant was agreeable to treatment. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of bipolar I disorder, alcohol abuse/dependence, and dependent personality traits. The GAF was 40.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was admitted to the hospital after having grand mal seizures. The Claimant was intubated and transferred to the intensive care unit. An echocardiogram was abnormal. On [REDACTED] left heart catheterization, coronary angiogram, and left ventriculogram were performed due to left ventricular systolic dysfunction. The catheterization and angiogram were normal. The ventriculogram showed global hypokinesis with an ejection fraction between 30 and 40 percent. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of status epilepticus and congestive heart failure.

On [REDACTED] the Claimant was admitted to the hospital with significant past history of seizures, questionable congestive heart failure, and alcohol abuse, with complaints of abdominal pain. A CT was positive for appendicitis resulting in a laparoscopic appendectomy. A psychiatric evaluation was performed resulting in the diagnoses of alcohol dependence and bipolar disorder. The GAF was 45. The Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED] with the diagnoses of status post upper laparoscopic appendectomy secondary to appendicitis, post-op fever (improved), hypothyroidism (stable), history of seizure (stable), alcohol withdrawal, thrombocytopenia, alcohol abuse, and history of anxiety.

On [REDACTED] a medication review was performed resulting in the renewal of prescribed treatment. The Claimant's mood swings and crying were noted. The diagnoses were bipolar I disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and alcohol abuse. The GAF was 20.

[REDACTED] progress notes show that the Claimant was more depressed.

On [REDACTED] a medication review was performed resulting in renewal of prescribed treatment. Progress notes indicate that the Claimant needed to shower/style hair, was tearful, sad, anxious, guarded, and worried. The diagnoses were bipolar I disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and alcohol abuse. The GAF was 20.

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 some medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. Mentally, the record shows that the degree of functional limitation on the Claimant's activities, social function, concentration, persistence, or pace is severe. The degree of functional limitation in the fourth area (episodes of decompensation) is 3 to 4. Ultimately, 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 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 physical and mental disabling impairments due to shortness of breath, congestive heart failure, diarrhea, seizure disorder, headaches, brain damage, depression, and anxiety.

Listing 12.00 encompasses adult mental disorders. The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work, and whether these limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 12.00A The existence of a medically determinable impairment(s) of the required duration must be established through medical evidence consisting of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings, to include psychological test findings. 12.00B The evaluation of disability on the basis of a mental disorder requires sufficient evidence to (1) establish the presence of a medically determinable mental impairment(s), (2) assess the degree of functional limitation the impairment(s) imposes, and (3) project the probable duration of the impairment(s). 12.00D The evaluation of disability on the basis of mental disorders requires documentation of a medically determinable impairment(s) and consideration of the degree in which the impairment limits the individual's ability to work consideration, and whether these limitations have lasted or are expected to last for a continuous period of at least 12 months. 12.00A

Listing 12.04 defines affective disorders as being characterized by a disturbance of mood, accompanied by a full or partial manic or depressive syndrome. Generally, affective disorders involve either depression or elation. The required level of severity for these disorders is met when the requirements of both A and B are satisfied, or when the requirements in C are satisfied.

- A. Medically documented persistence, either continuous or intermittent, of one of the following:
 - 1. Depressive syndrome characterized by at least four of the following:
 - a. Anhedonia or pervasive loss of interest in almost all activities; or
 - b. Appetite disturbance with change in weight; or
 - c. Sleep disturbance; or
 - d. Psychomotor agitation or retardation; or
 - e. Decreased energy; or
 - f. Feelings of guilt or worthlessness; or

- g. Difficulty concentrating or thinking; or
 - h. Thoughts of suicide; or
 - i. Hallucinations, delusions, or paranoid thinking; or
- 2. Manic syndrome characterized by at least three of the following:
 - a. Hyperactivity; or
 - b. Pressure of speech; or
 - c. Flight of ideas; or
 - d. Inflated self-esteem; or
 - e. Decreased need for sleep; or
 - f. Easy distractability; or
 - g. Involvement in activities that have a high probability of painful consequences which are not recognized; or
 - h. Hallucinations, delusions, or paranoid thinking; or
- 3. Bipolar syndrome with a history of episodic periods manifested by the full symptomatic picture of both manic and depressive syndromes (and currently characterized by either or both syndromes)

AND

- B. Resulting in at least two of the following:
 - 1. Marked restriction on activities of daily living; or
 - 2. Marked difficulties in maintaining social functioning; or
 - 3. Marked difficulties in maintaining concentration, persistence, or pace; or
 - 4. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration;

OR

- C. Medically documented history of chronic affective disorder of at least 2 years' duration that has caused more than a minimal limitation of ability to do basic work activities, with symptoms or signs currently attenuated by medication or psychosocial support, and one of the following:
 - 1. Repeated episodes of decompensation, each of extended duration; or
 - 2. A residual disease process that has resulted in such marginal adjustment that even minimal increase in mental demands or

change in the environment would be predicted to cause the individual to decompensate; or

3. Current history of 1 or more years' inability to function outside a highly supportive living arrangement, with an indication of continued need for such an arrangement.

In this case, the evidence shows that the Claimant suffers with severe depression, bipolar disorder, alcohol dependence, and anxiety. The records confirm the Claimant's mood swings, crying spells, loss of interest in almost all activities, appetite disturbance with weight change, sleep disturbance, decreased energy, and suicide attempts. As a result, the Claimant is markedly limited in her activities of daily living and social functioning. Further, the evidence shows repeated episodes of decompensation as evident by the Claimant's continued treatment and GAF scores. The Claimant's GAF in [REDACTED] was 35; [REDACTED] 40; [REDACTED] and in [REDACTED] 20. A GAF between 30 and 40 represents some impairment in reality testing or communication OR major impairment in several areas, such as work or school, family relations, judgment, thinking, or mood, while a GAF of 20 so some danger of hurting self or others OR occasionally fails to maintain minimal personal hygiene OR gross impairment in communication. In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant's mental impairments meet, or are the equivalent thereof, a listed impairment within 12.00, specifically, 12.04. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

DECISION AND ORDER


The Administrative Law Judge, based on 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 The Department shall initiate processing of the August 9, 2011 application, retroactive to May 2011, to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform the Claimant of the determination in accordance with department policy.
3. The Department shall supplement for lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with department policy.

2012-37115/CMM

4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in August 2013 in accordance with department policy.


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

Date Signed: July 19, 2012

Date Mailed: July 19, 2012

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

2012-37115/CMM

CMM/cl

cc:

