

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-55364  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 19, 2012  
County: Kalamazoo

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Vicki L. Armstrong

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge upon the Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due notice, an in person hearing was commenced on September 19, 2012, from Kalamazoo, Michigan. Claimant represented by [REDACTED] from [REDACTED], personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Lead Worker [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department of Human Services (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and Retro-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 June 29, 2011, Claimant filed an application for MA-P and Retro-MA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On February 23, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro-MA indicating that he was capable of performing other work, pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920(f).
- (3) On February 28, 2012, the department caseworker sent Claimant notice that his application was denied.
- (4) On May 9, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.

- (5) On August 13, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT ) found Claimant was not disabled and retained the ability to perform past work as a maintenance worker . (Department Exhibit B, pp 1-2).
- (6) Claimant has a history of Lupus, empty center disease, spot on lungs, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cardiac arrhythmia, anterior stromal corneal scars in both eyes, emphysema and arthritis.
- (7) On March 29, 2011, Claimant was brought to the emergency department by ambulance for an assault. Claimant was admitted to the hospital. X-rays showed he had a nondisplaced fracture of the left 8<sup>th</sup> rib posterolaterally with associated large left pneumothorax. There was also mild bilateral airspace opacities consistent with atelectasis. The left-sided pneumothorax was resolved post pneumovax placement. Claimant was discharged on March 30, 2011 in stable condition. (Department Exhibit A, pp 61-97).
- (8) On January 6, 2012, Claimant underwent a medical examination on behalf of the department. The examining physician noted Claimant's right pupil was fixed at approximately 4mm. His fundi appeared stable. His left eye was contracted approximately 2mm and was poorly visualized. He had significant diminished vision bilaterally and walked with a cane, predominantly as a vision assistant. His hand pain appeared to have mild osteoarthritic disease, in addition to nail pallor and some mild clubbing. There were no findings of cardiac decompensation or congenital heart defects. He quoted a history of a spot on his lung and had some mild emphysematous disease, but did not appear dyspneic. He had recently quit tobacco use. His overall degree of impairment appeared moderate and his prognosis was guarded and potentially not remedial. (Department Exhibit A, pp 35-39).
- (9) On February 27, 2012, Claimant's optometrist opined that Claimant's visual fields were constricted and his prognosis was uncertain based on his well healed minor anterior stromal corneal scars off axis in the right eye and two in the left eye also off axis. As a result, the optometrist restricted Claimant from driving given his poor visual fields and borderline acuity. The optometrist also opined that it would be unwise for Claimant to pursue his usual vocation of tree cutting for safety reasons, unless or until his vision improves. It was also noted that despite lab and radiology testing and evaluation by a retinal specialist, no specific cause or source could be found for Claimant's vision disturbance. (Claimant Exhibit A, pp 1-2).

- (10) On July 5, 2012, Claimant underwent a psychological examination on behalf of the Disability Determination Service. Diagnosis: Axis I: Anxiety disorder; Nicotine abuse; Axis II: Rule out borderline intellectual functioning; Axis III: Visual problems; COPD; Emphysema; Chronic pain; Arthritis; Cardiac arrhythmia; Headaches; Axis V: 58. Prognosis was guarded. He attributed his problems to medical issues and appeared to be anxious about his medical problems which likely increased his tension and stress. (Department Exhibit B, pp 8-13).
- (11) Claimant is a 44 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'4" tall and weighs 160 lbs. Claimant completed a GED.
- (12) Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) 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 Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 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 to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being 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 and 20 CFR 416.929. By the same token, a conclusory statement by a physician 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 determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, 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 experience. 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 laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment. 20 CFR 416.929(a).

Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease 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 basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without 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 capacity is what an individual can do despite 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 classify jobs as sedentary, light, 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 defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary 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 walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls. 20 CFR 416.967(b). Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with 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 sedentary 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 of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine 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 decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several 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:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
2. 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 client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
3. 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 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. 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-#11 above this Administrative Law Judge answers:

Step 1: No.

Step 2: Yes.

Step 3: Yes. Claimant has shown, by clear and convincing documentary evidence and credible testimony, his physical impairments meet or equal Listing 2.02 and Listing 2.04:

**2.02 Loss of Visual Acuity.** Remaining vision in the better eye after best correction is 20/200 or less.

and

**2.04 Loss of visual efficiency.** Visual efficiency of the better eye of 20 percent or less after best correction (see 2.00A7c).

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program. Consequently, the department's denial of his June 29, 2011, MA/Retro-MA application cannot be upheld.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of 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 Claimant's June 29, 2011, MA/Retro-MA application, and shall award him all the benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
2. The department shall review Claimant's medical condition for improvement in October, 2014, unless his Social Security 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 his 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 5, 2012

Date Mailed: October 8, 2012

**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 receipt date of the rehearing decision.

VLA/las

cc:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names of the recipients listed in the 'cc:' field.