

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201153706  
Issue No: 2009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 27, 2012  
Jackson County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Y. Lain

**AMENDED 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 to protest the denial of claimant's application for MA. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on November 27, 2012. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Claimant was represented by [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

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

**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 December 3, 2010, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
2. On April 20, 2011, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairments lacked duration.
3. On May 17, 2011, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
4. On August 18, 2011, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
5. On August 29, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendations:

The claimant was admitted in January 2011 for chest pain and epigastric pain. A previous stress test revealed inferior septum reversible defect and thinning of the lateral wall with preserved ejection fraction. Serial troponins and EKGs were done and showed no changes. Primary diagnoses were chest pain and epigastric pain, SCS rules out. Physical examination showed she was slightly obese, but was otherwise unremarkable. The medical evidence of record does not document a mental/physical impairment that significantly limits the claimant's ability to perform basic work activities. Therefore, MA-P is denied per 20 CFR 416.921(a). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and was also denied.

6. The hearing was held on November 27, 2012. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
7. Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on November 28, 2012.
8. On December 18, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team approved claimant stating in its recommendation:

Claimant has a history of obesity, coronary artery disease with stents, chest pain (non-cardiac), chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hypertension and depression. The medical evidence does not indicate claimant has severe limitations resulting from mental impairments. However, considering the history of impairments, the combination of cardiac and pulmonary conditions in addition to morbid obesity, and the medical opinion in file, claimant is restricted to light work. The claimant is not currently engaging in substantial gainful activity (SGA) based on the information that is available in the file. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light work. Claimant's past work was performed at the medium exertional level. Therefore, she is unable to perform her past work. Based on the claimant's vocational profile, MA-P is approved using Vocational Rule 202.06 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is approved effective November 2010.

9. Claimant is a 57-year-old woman whose date of birth is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'4" tall and weighs 210 pounds. Claimant is a high school graduate and is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
10. Claimant has worked as a machine operator and sorting parts.
11. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: angina, kidney stones, knee pain, back pain, cellulitis, coronary artery disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, asthma, shoulder problems, back problems, chest pain, depression and anxiety.

### **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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Because of the SHRT determination, it is not necessary for the Administrative Law Judge to discuss the issue of disability, per BAM, Item 600.

The department is required to initiate a determination of claimant's financial eligibility for the requested benefits, if not previously done.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the claimant meets the definition of medically disabled under the Medical Assistance Program as of the December 3, 2010 application date and for the month of November 2010.

Accordingly, the department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application if it is not already done so, to determine if all other non-medical eligibility criteria are met. The department shall inform the claimant of the determination in writing.

A medical review should be scheduled for January 2014. The department should check to see if claimant is in current payment status or not. If the claimant is in current payment status at the medical review no further action will be necessary. However, if the claimant is not in current payment status at the medical review, the department is to obtain updated application forms (DHS49) and obtain updated medical records.

It is ORDERED that the department shall review this case in one year from the date of this Decision and Order.

Landis

/s/

Y. Lain  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 24, 2013

Date Mailed: January 24, 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 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  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P. O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LYL/db

cc:

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