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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2012-62943

2009

Issue No.:

Case No.: Hearing Date:

October 25, 2012

County: Genesee-02

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Ad ministrative Law Judge upon Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Mi chigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due not ice, an inperson hearing was commenced on Oc tober 25, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant, represented by Mr. of Advomas, personally ap peared and testified. Participant s on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist

ISSUE

Whether the Department of Human Serv ices (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA)?

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 February 14, 2012, Claimant filed an application for MA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On March 26, 2012, t he Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro-MA for lack of duration. (D epartment Exhibit A, pp 1-2).
- (3) On April 10, 2012, the department ca seworker sent Cla imant notice that her application was denied.
- (4) On July 3, 2012, Claimant's representative filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

- (5) On August 17, 2012, the Stat e Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found Claimant was not disabled due to lack of duration. (Department Exhibit B, p 1).
- (6) Claimant has a history of multip le sclerosis, optic neu ritis, osteoporosis, post neck surgery, chronic bac k pain, anxiety, depression and a sleep disorder.
- (7) On January 20, 2012, Claiman t was admitted to the hospital. She originally presented to the emergen cy department on January 20, 2012, post MRI results. She began experienci ng left eye visual loss on January 12, 2012, and was seen in the emergency department on January 13, 2012. The eye exam at that time was negative and she was sent to an ophthalmologist, who in turn sent her to a neuro-ophthalmologist, and then she was again sent to the emergen cy department. She saw her primary care physician on January 20, 2012, to have an MRI. On receiving the MRI results, her physician referred her to the emergen cy department with worsening symptoms. Claimant states she cannot accurately see colors in her left eye and her right eye is occluded. She also c omplains of blurry vision in her left eye. She cannot see bright lights. She is als difficulty word finding and finding her way around the hospital. The MRI Orbits with and without contrast re vealed T2 hyperintensity and a bnormal enhancement of the left optic nerve, with a diagnosis of left optic neuritis. She appears to be compensating well for her visual defects at this time. She was discharged on January 25, 2012. (Department Exhibit A, pp 8-69).
- (8) On July 24, 2012, the MRI of CI aimant's cervical spine with and without contrast revealed moderate sized left posterolateral and intraforaminal C6-C7 disc pr otrusion with severe left-sided C6-C7 foraminal stenosis. The MRI also showed mild mid to lowe r c ervical spine disc degeneration without spinal stenosis. (Claimant Exhibit A-B).
- (9) On August 9, 2012, Claimant underwent a medical evaluation by her neurologist on behalf of the departm ent. Claimant is diagnos ed wit h Multiple Sc lerosis. S he had an iso lated episode of left optic neuritis in January, 2012. She has difficult y swallowing and fatigue. She also has a gait abnor mality with a slow, impaired tandem. The neurologist opined she has physical limitat ions of lifting/c arrying less than 10 pounds, standing/walking less than 2 hours a day and sitting 6 hours a day which are expected to last more than 90 days. (Claimant Exhibit C-D).
- (10) On October 22, 2012, Claimant underwent an anterior cervical fusion. Claimant testified she is to continue wearing the collar for another 6

weeks, and can only remove the collar to shower, during which, she must hold her head up when the collar is not worn.

- (11) On October 25, 2012, Claimant attended this hearing wearing a cervical collar and using a cane to ambulate. She was in o bvious pain during the hearing and very tearful. She had problems sitting comfortably and difficulties getting up from the chair. She had to use her right ar m to get up from the chair, as her left a rm appeared to have decreased strength and motion. She also moved very slowly to and from the hearing room, even with the assistance of the c ane. She continues to have residual effects from the optic neurit is and is unable to see clearly out of her left eye. She is also having noticeable problems speaking and swallowing.
- (12) Claimant is a 51 year old woman whose birthday is July 4, 1961. Claimant is 5'4" tall and weighs 90 lbs. Claimant c ompleted high sc hool. She last worked in June, 2009.
- (13) Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Securi ty disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medic al Assistance (MA) program is est ablished by the Title XIX of the Socia I Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independ ence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Brindges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT). 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:

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.

The person claiming a physica I 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, di agnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged, 20 CF R 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaint s are not, in and of the mselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CF R 416.908 and 20 CF R 416.929. By the same token, a conclusory statement by a physici an or mental health

professional that an individual is disabled or blind is not sufficient without supporting medical evidence to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.929.

A set order is used to deter mine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past wor k, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. 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.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experienc e. 20 CFR 416.920(c). If the impairment, or combination of impairments, do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laborator y findings which demonstrate a medical impairment. 20 CFR 416.929(a).

Medical reports should include -

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (suc h as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of dis ease or injury based on its signs and symptoms). 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing bas ic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities with out 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).

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).

The residual functional capac ity is what an individual can do desp ite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated. 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we class ify jobs as sedentary, lig ht, 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 def ined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of wa lking and standing is often necess ary 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 walk ing or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg c ontrols. 20 CFR 416.967(b). Medium work involves lifting no more t han 50 pounds at a time wit h 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 sedentar y 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 o f objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If som eone can do heavy work, we deter mine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

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

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that s everal considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

- Does the client perf orm Substantial Gainful Activit y (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
- Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the cli ent is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analys is c ontinues t o Step 3. 20 CF R 416.920(c).
- Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
- 4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 year s? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
- Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

Based on Finding of Fact #6-#12 above this Administrative Law Judge answers:

Step 1: No.

Step 2: Yes.

Step 3: Yes. Claimant has show n, by clear and convincing documentary evidence and credible testim ony, her physical impairments meet or equal Listing 11.09:

11.09 Multiple sclerosis. With:

A. Disorganization of motor function as described in 11.04B; or

B. Visual or mental impai rment as described under the criteria in 2.02, 2.03, 2.04, or 12.02; or

C. Signific ant, reproducible fatigue of motor function with substantial muscle weakness on repetitive activity, demonstrated on physical examination, resulting from neurological dysfunc tion in ar eas of the central nervous system known to be pat hologically involved by the multiple sclerosis process.

Accordingly, this Ad ministrative Law Judg e concludes that Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA/Retro-MA programs. Cons equently, the department's denial of her February 14, 2012, MA/Retro-MA application cannot be upheld.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

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

- 1. The department shall process Claim ant's February 14, 2012, MA/Retro-MA application, and shall award her all the benefits she may be entitled to receive, as long as she meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
- 2. The department shall rev iew Claimant's medica I cond ition for improvement in October, 2014, unless her Social Sec urity 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 her continued treatment, progress and prognosis at review.

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

Date Signed: October 26, 2012

Date Mailed: October 29, 2012

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der 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 Hear ings 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

VLA/las



