

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-5299
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 29, 2013
County: Wayne (82-76)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on April 29, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant is not "disabled" for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) program?

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 16, 2011, Claimant applied for MA-P and retro MA-P to September 2011.
2. On July 12, 2012, the Medical Review Team denied Claimant's request.
3. On October 10, 2012, Claimant submitted to the Department a request for hearing.
4. The State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) approved MA back to October 2011 and denied Claimant's request for retro MA back to September 2011.

5. Claimant is 35 years old.
6. Claimant completed education through the 11th grade.
7. Claimant has employment experience (last worked 2006) as a dish washer/stocker for a fast food restaurant.
8. Claimant's limitations have lasted for 12 months or more.
9. Claimant suffers from asthma, dizziness, abdominal pain and pancreatitis.
10. Claimant has significant limitations on physical activities involving sitting, standing, walking, bending, lifting, and stooping.
11. Claimant weighed 306 lbs and stood 5'11" according to Exhibit 1 p. 63. This yields a Body Mass Index of 42.7.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

MA-P 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 administers MA-P 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).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under MA-P. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...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.

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 are 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.

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

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).

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work). 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

Social Security Ruling 02-01 directs adjudicators to consider that the combined effects of obesity with other impairments may be greater than the non-obesity impairment alone. The National Institute of Health Clinical Guidelines for Obesity define three levels of obesity. Level I includes Body Mass Index (BMIs) of 30.0-34.9; Level II includes BMIs of 35.0-39.9; and Level III extreme obesity is considered over 40.0. Obesity at Level III represents a condition which creates the greatest risk for developing obesity-related impairments. Claimant's weight was 306 lbs and he is 5'11" in height. Claimant's obesity as measured by his BMI may be calculated using the Center for Disease Control and Prevention Body Mass Index calculation found at: <http://cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/bmi/adult BMI/english bmi calculator/bmi calculator.htm>.

The formula for calculating BMI is as follows: Calculate BMI by dividing weight in pounds by height in inches squared and multiplying by a conversion factor of 703. This formula as applied to Claimant's height and weight yields a BMI of 42.7 or Level III obesity. This level of obesity surely impacts Claimant's asthma condition.

Social Security Ruling SSR-02 provides in pertinent part:

Because there is no listing for obesity, we will find that an individual with obesity "meets" the requirements of a listing if he or she has another impairment that, by itself, meets the requirements of a listing. We will also find that a listing is met if there is an impairment that, in combination with obesity, meets the requirements of a listing. For example, obesity may increase the severity of coexisting or related impairments to the extent that the combination of impairments meets the requirements of a listing. This is especially true of musculoskeletal, respiratory, and cardiovascular impairments. It may also be true for other coexisting or related impairments, including mental disorders.

In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant may be considered presently disabled at the third step. Claimant appears to meet listing 3.03 or its

equivalent. This Administrative Law Judge will not continue through the remaining steps of the assessment. Claimant's testimony and the medical documentation support the finding that Claimant meets the requirements of a listing.

Therefore, Claimant is found to be disabled.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Claimant is medically disabled as of September 2011.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby REVERSED and the Department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application dated December 16, 2011, if not done previously, to determine Claimant's non-medical eligibility. The Department shall inform Claimant of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for July 2014.



Jonathan W. Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 7, 2013

Date Mailed: May 7, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (60 days for FAP cases)

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.

2013-5299/JWO

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

JWO/pf

cc:

