

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-68473
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 6, 2012
County: Wayne (15)

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 Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a hearing was conducted in Detroit, Michigan on December 6, 2012. Claimant appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED], MCW, ES, appeared on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department").

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received, reviewed, and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) for consideration. On February 4, 2013, this office received the SHRT determination, which found Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit programs.

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 and SDA benefits on March 5, 2012.

2. On March 23, 2012, the Social Security Administration (SSA) issued a Notice of Decision—Unfavorable, which decision was being appealed at the time of this hearing.
3. On May 21, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not disabled.
4. The Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination on May 23, 2012.
5. On July 27, 2012, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.
6. On September 26, 2012, SHRT found Claimant not disabled.
7. During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received, reviewed and forwarded to SHRT for consideration. On February 4, 2013, this office received the SHRT determination, which found Claimant not disabled.
8. At the time of the hearing, the Claimant was 49 years old with a birth date of [REDACTED].
9. Claimant has a tenth grade education.
10. Claimant is not currently working.
11. Claimant suffers from schizoaffective disorder. (Exhibit A, p. 6)
12. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of twelve months or longer.
13. 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 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 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 the present case, The SSA issued a Notice of Decision---Unfavorable on March 23, 2012 (Exhibit 2, p. 3), which decision was being appealed at the time of this hearing.

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 may not be 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 has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on Claimant's work activities. The March 23, 2012 psychological examination report shows Claimant to have schizoaffective disorder and a GAF score of 40. (Exhibit A, pp. 5, 6)

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 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.

In the present case, Claimant has alleged mental disabling impairments. (Exhibit 2, p.3)

When evaluating mental impairments, a special technique is used. 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).

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.)

Listing 12.03 is pertinent in this matter:

12.03 Schizophrenic, paranoid and other psychotic disorders:

Characterized by the onset of psychotic features with deterioration from a previous level of functioning.

The required level of severity for these disorders is met when the requirements in both A and B are satisfied, or when the requirements in C are satisfied

A. Medically documented persistence, either continuous or intermittent, of one or more of the following:

1. Delusions or hallucinations; or
2. Catatonic or other grossly disorganized behavior; or
3. Incoherence, loosening of associations, illogical thinking, or poverty of content of speech if associated with one of the following:
 - a. Blunt affect; or
 - b. Flat affect; or
 - b. Flat affect; or
 - c. Inappropriate affect;

OR

4. Emotional withdrawal and/or isolation;

AND

B. Resulting in at least two of the following:

1. Marked restriction of 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 a chronic schizophrenic, paranoid, or other psychotic 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 a 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 the present case, the psychological examination report from Sinai-Grace Outpatient Clinic of March 23, 2012 shows Claimant as having a diagnosis of schizoaffective disorder and a GAF score of 40. Claimant had a blunt affect. Claimant described hearing voices for the last couple of years. Claimant had been treating with Sinai-Grace Outpatient Clinic since September of 2010. (Exhibit A, pp. 5, 6).

The Mental Residual Functional Capacity Assessment of August 16, 2012 from the Department of Psychiatry of Sinai Grace indicates that Claimant has a history of paranoid and auditory hallucinations. The report further details, "Medication has somewhat decreased symptoms, but they continue to have significant impact in daily functioning. Patient tends to stay isolated, frequently staying in his bedroom. He feels very uncomfortable using public transportation due to paranoia. Patient continues to experience significant anxiety as well as depressed mood." (Exhibit A, p. 4) Claimant was found to be markedly limited in the ability to understand and remember detailed instructions, the ability to carry out detailed instructions, the ability to maintain attention and concentration for extended periods, the ability to perform activities with a schedule, maintain regular attendance and be punctual with customary tolerances, the ability to sustain an ordinary routine without supervision, the ability to work in coordination with or proximity to others without being distracted by them, the ability to complete a normal work day, the ability to accept instructions and respond appropriately to criticism from supervisors, the ability to maintain socially appropriate behavior, and the ability to respond appropriately to change in work setting, and the ability to travel in unfamiliar places or use public transportation.

In light of the foregoing, it is found that the Claimant's impairment meets, or is the medical equivalent thereof, of a listed impairment within 12.00, specifically 12.03 A and B. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code Rule 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program; therefore, he is found disabled for purposes of the SDA benefit program.


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 and SDA benefit programs as of March 1, 2012.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

2012-68473/SCB

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate processing of the March 5, 2012 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 supplement for any lost benefits that Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible, in accordance with Department policy.
4. The Department shall review Claimant's continued eligibility March of 2014, in accordance with Department policy.



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

Date Signed: February 5, 2013

Date Mailed: February 6, 2013

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 mailing 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,

2012-68473/SCB

- 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

SCB/tm

cc:

