

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-56858
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: 115697205
Hearing Date: [REDACTED]
County: Wayne (82)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

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 telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on August 20, 2012. Claimant appeared and testified. [REDACTED], appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department).

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that 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. Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P benefits and Retro MA on May 2, 2012.
2. On May 21, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not disabled.
3. The Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination on May 23, 2012.
4. On June 6, 2012, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.

5. On July 13, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team found Claimant not disabled.
6. At the time of the hearing, Claimant was 54 years old with a birth date of [REDACTED]
7. Claimant has a high school education.
8. Claimant is not currently working.
9. Claimant last worked as an auto mechanic. Claimant also worked in auto parts sales and as a car wash attendant.
10. Claimant suffers from coronary artery disease, hypertension, bilateral leg swelling, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hyperlipidemia, and acute and chronic kidney injury. (Exhibit 1, p. 9)
11. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of twelve months or longer.
12. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, 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

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 Department 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 Bridges Reference Tables (RFT).

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition for "disabled" as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

"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.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. (SGA) 20 CFR 416.920(b).

In this case, Claimant is not currently working. Claimant testified credibly that he is not currently working and the Department presented no contradictory evidence. Therefore, Claimant is not disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Second, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment expected to last twelve months or more (or result in death) which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. The term "basic work activities" means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the Department may only screen out claims at this level which are "totally groundless" solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a "*de minimus* hurdle" in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, medical evidence has clearly established that Claimant suffers from coronary artery disease, hypertension, bilateral leg swelling, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hyperlipidemia, and acute and chronic kidney injury. (Exhibit 1, p. 9)

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, meets or medically equals the criteria of an impairment listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. (20 CFR 416.920 (d), 416.925, and 416.926.) This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant's medical record will not support a finding that Claimant's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or is medically equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A. This Administrative Law Judge consulted all listings, including 3.00 and 4.00. Accordingly, Claimant cannot be found to be disabled based upon medical evidence alone. 20 CFR 416.920(d).

In the fourth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant has the residual functional capacity (RFC) to perform the requirements of Claimant's past relevant work. 20 CFR 416.920(a) (4) (iv).

An individual's residual functional capacity is the individual's ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from the individual's impairments. Residual functional capacity 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. Residual functional capacity is the most that can be done, despite the limitations. In making this finding, the trier of fact must consider all of the Claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe (20 CFR 416.920 (e) and 416.945; SSR 96-8p.) Further, a residual functional capacity assessment must be based on all relevant evidence in the case record, such as medical history, laboratory findings, the effects of treatments (including limitations or restrictions imposed by the mechanics of treatment), reports of daily activities, lay evidence, recorded observations, medical treating source statements, effects of symptoms (including pain) that are reasonably attributed to the impairment, and evidence from attempts to work. SSR 96-8p.

The term past relevant work means work performed (either as Claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last fifteen years or fifteen 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 substantially gainfully employed (20 CFR 416.960 (b) and 416.965.) If Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do Claimant's past relevant work, Claimant is not disabled. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). If 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.

The medical information indicates that Claimant suffers from coronary artery disease, hypertension, bilateral leg swelling, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive

pulmonary disease, hyperlipidemia, and acute and chronic kidney injury. (Exhibit 1, p. 9) Claimant also is a recipient of an implantable cardioverter defibrillator. (Exhibit 1, p. 7)

Claimant's past relevant work included employment as an auto mechanic, auto parts sales person, and a worker in a car wash. Given the functional requirements as stated by Claimant of this work (which is consistent with how these jobs are typically performed), this Administrative Law Judge concludes that Claimant does not retain the capacity to perform his past relevant work.

In the fifth step of the sequential consideration of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment(s) prevents Claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the Claimant's:

- (1) residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations?" 20 CFR 416.945;
- (2) age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-.965; and
- (3) the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the Claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

See *Felton v DSS*, 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once Claimant reaches Step 5 in the sequential review process, Claimant has already established a *prima facie* case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962 (6th Cir, 1984). At that point, the burden of proof is on the state to prove by substantial evidence that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity.

For the purpose of determining the exertional requirements of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as "sedentary", "light", "medium", "heavy", and "very heavy." 20 CFR 416.967. These terms have the same meaning as are used in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. 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 (exertional requirements, i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lifting, carrying, pushing, or pulling) are considered nonexertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a) In considering whether an individual can perform past relevant work, a comparison of the individual's residual functional capacity with the demands of past relevant work. *Id.* If an individual can no longer do past relevant work the same residual functional capacity assessment along with an individual's age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an individual can adjust to other work which exists in the national economy. *Id.* Examples of non-exertional limitations or restrictions include difficulty function 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.*

Claimant is fifty-four years old with a high school education, and a history of unskilled to semi-skilled work as an auto mechanic, a auto parts sales clerk and car wash attendant, (20 CFR. 416.968) performed at the light to heavy level. (20 CFR 416.967). Claimant's medical records are consistent with Claimant's testimony that Claimant is unable to engage in even a full range of sedentary work. See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986). Claimant testified credibly that he cannot stand for more than ten minutes, he can walk only short distances before he loses breath, and he cannot take stairs. Claimant stated that he cannot lift more than five pounds.

The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that

given Claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the Claimant could perform despite Claimant's limitations. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program.


In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program as of February 1, 2012.

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 program, as of February 1, 2012.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate processing of the May 2, 2012 application and Retro application to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform Claimant of the determination in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department shall review Claimant's continued eligibility in October of 2013, in accordance with Department policy.



Susan C. Burke
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 30, 2012

Date Mailed: August 30, 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
Re consideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SCB/cl

cc: [REDACTED]
Wayne County DHS (82)/DHS-1843

S. [REDACTED]
Burke