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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Issue No: 2009

Reg. No: 201313857

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Aaron McClintic

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant 's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on Department was represented by

<u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department pr operly deny Claim ant's Medica I Assistance program (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. Claimant applied for MA-P on retroactive coverage back to . , with a req uest for
- 2. The Medical Review Team denied the application on
- 3. Claimant filed a request for hearing on MA denial.
- 4. A telephone hearing was held on
- On ______, the State Hearing Review Team denied the application because the Claimant retain is the capacity to perform light work.
- 6. Claimant is 5' 2" tall and weighs 175 pounds.

- 7. Claimant is 37 years of age.
- Claimant's impairments have been medically diagnosed as right knee injury, asthma.
- 9. Claimant has the follo wing symptoms: shortness of breath, pain, fatigue and joint swelling.
- 10. Claimant completed high school.
- 11. Claimant is able to read, write, and perform basic math skills.
- 12. Claimant is not working. Claimant last worked in Claimant previously worked as a fast food worker.
- 13. Claimant lives with her aunt.
- 14. Claimant testified that she cannot perform some household chores.
- 15. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
 - a. b. c. d.
- 16. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
 - i. Sitting: couple hoursii. Standing: 60 minutesiii. Walking: 2 blocksiv. Bend/stoop: no difficulty
 - v. Lifting: 5-10 lbs.
 - vi. Grip/grasp: no limitations

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and a ppeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An oppor tunity for a hearing shall be granted to an ap plicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

The Medic al Assistance (MA-P) 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 administers the MA-P 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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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

...the inability to do any substant ial 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.

Federal regulations r equire 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 determining whether an indiv idual is disabled, 20 CFR 4 16.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual f unctional c apacity, 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 t he individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.9 20(b). In this case, the Claimant is not working; therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified a this step in the evaluation.

The second step to be determined in consi dering whether the Clai mant is considered disabled is whether the severity of the impairment. In order to qualify the impairment must be considered severe which is defined as an impairment which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Examples of these include:

- 1. Physical functions s uch as walkin g, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, 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).

In this case, the Claimant's medical evidence of record supports a finding that Claimant has significant physical and mental limitations upon Claimant's ability to perform basic work activities such as walk ing, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling; Medical evidence has clearly established that the Claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on the Claimant's work activities. See Social Security Rulings: 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

In the third step of the analysi s, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment (or combination of impairments) is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant's medical record does not support a finding that the Claimant's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR Part 404, Part A. Listing 1.02 was considered.

The person claiming a physica I or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/pre scribed treatment, prognosis for a 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 CRF 416.913. A conc lusory statement by a physici an or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind is not sufficient, without supporting medical evidence, to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

The fourth step of the analys is to be considered is whether the Claimant has the ability to perform work previously performed by the Claimant within the past 15 yiears. The trier of fact must determine whether the impairment(s) prevent the Claimant from doing past relevant work. In the present case in the Claimant's past employment was as a factory worker and fast food worker. Working a is a fast food worker based on Claimant's testimony priesented at hearing would be considered light exertional work. Claimant would be able to perform her past relevant work because it she is able to do the requisite lifting, standing and walk ing for light exertional work on a full time basis. Therefore, Claimant's appeal is denied at Stiep 4. Claimant's testimony regarding hier

physical limitations was not supported by s ubstantial medical evidence. Claimant 's appeal could have been denied on durational grounds as her condition has improved since the date of injury and continues to improve.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, decides that Claimant is not medically dis abled for the purpos es of MA-P eligibility.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

Am mati Aaron Administrative Maura Corrigan, Director for of Human Services Department

McClintic

Law Judge

Date Signed: 04/25/2013

Date Mailed: 04/25/2013

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsider either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decis ion and O rder. Administrative Hearings will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's moti on where the final decision cannot be implemented within 60 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 ot her relevant iss ues in the hearing decision.

201313857/AM

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

AM/kl

