

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No: 2012-36883

Issue No: 2009

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: [REDACTED]

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, an in-person hearing was held on [REDACTED]. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]. Claimant appeared and provided testimony. The department witness that provided testimony was [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny claimant's Medical Assistance (MA-P) application?

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 [REDACTED] claimant applied for MA-P with the Michigan DHS.
2. Claimant did apply for retro MA.
3. On [REDACTED], the MRT denied.
4. On [REDACTED], the DHS issued notice.
5. On [REDACTED], claimant/Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) filed a hearing request.
6. On [REDACTED] the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied claimant.

7. Claimant has been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Claimant has had a final determination by SSA. An SOLQ verification from SSA indicates claimant applied on [REDACTED] and received an adverse decision. Claimant appealed the decision and received an unfavorable decision at the appeals level on [REDACTED]. Claimant failed to file at the Appeals Council within the appeal time period. The same conditions were addressed in the SSA decision. None of the exceptions apply.
8. The [REDACTED] SHRT decision is adopted and incorporated by reference herein.

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 Bridges Reference Manual (RFT).

Prior to any substantive review, jurisdiction is paramount. Applicable to the case herein, policy states:

Final SSI Disability Determination

SSA's determination that disability or blindness does **not** exist for SSI purposes is **final** for MA if:

- . The determination was made after 1/1/90, **and**
- . No further appeals may be made at SSA, **or**
- . The client failed to file an appeal at any step within SSA's 60-day limit, **and**
- . The client is **not** claiming:
 - .. A totally different disabling condition than the condition SSA based its determination on, **or**
 - .. An additional impairment(s) or change or deterioration in his condition that SSA has **not** made a determination on.

Eligibility for MA based on disability or blindness does **not** exist once SSA's determination is **final**. BEM, Item 260, pp. 2-3.

Relevant federal regulations are found at 42 CFR Part 435. These regulations provide: "An SSA disability determination is binding on an agency until the determination is changed by the SSA." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(i). These regulations further provide: "If the SSA determination is changed, the new determination is also binding on the agency." 42 CFR 435.541(a)(b)(ii).

In this case, verification from the Social Security Administration indicates a final determination pursuant to an [REDACTED] application. Claimant's claim was considered by SSA and benefits denied. The determination was final once Claimant failed to appeal the unfavorable decision issued on [REDACTED]. Claimant is alleging the same impairments. None of the exceptions apply.

For these reasons, under the above-cited policy and federal law, this Administrative Law Judge has no jurisdiction to proceed with a substantive review. The department's denial must be upheld.

As noted above, should the SSA change its determination, then the new determination would also be binding on the DHS.

In the alternative, should the sequential analysis be applied, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge would concur with the findings and conclusions of the SHRT decisions in finding claimant not disabled under federal law and state policy. Claimant is found to retain the capacity to perform light work and would be denied MA-P using Medical-Vocational Rule 202.21 as a guide.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is **UPHELD**.

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

Date Signed: [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: [REDACTED]

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.

SLM/jk

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covering several lines of text in the cc field.

MAHS