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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:
2013-18866

Issue No:
2009;4031

Case No:
Image: Comparison of the second second

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notic e, a telephone hearing was held on April 16, 2013. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

<u>ISSUE</u>

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

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 September 14, 2012, c laimant filed an application for Medica I Assistance, Retroactive Medic al Assistance and St ate Disab ility Assistance benefits alleging disability.
- 2. On November 30, 2012, the Medi cal Rev iew Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairments were non-exertional.
- 3. On December 4, 2012, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
- 4. On December 17, 2012, claimant f iled a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- 5. On February 19, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its ana lysis and recommendation: the medical evidence of record indic ates that the claimant reasonably retains the capacity to perform light exertion al tasks of a simple and repetitive nature. The claimant is not currently engaging in substantial gainful activity based on the information that is avalable in file. The claimant's

impairments/combination of impairments does not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Soc ial Security Admini stration listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform light exertional tasks of a simple and r epetitive nature. The claimant's past work was: un-described self employment. As such, the claimant would be unable to perform the duties associated with their past work. Likewise, the claimant's past work skills will not transfer to other occupations. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational prof ile (46 years old, a high school education and a history of un-described self employment), MA-P is denied 20CFR416.920(e&g), using Vocationa I Rule 202. 20 as a quide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this determination and is also denied. SDA is denied per BEM 261 because the nature and severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above state level for 90 days. Listings 1.04, 11. 14 and 12.04 were considere d in this determination.

- 6. Claimant is a 47-year-old man w hose b irth date is Claimant is 5'10" tall and weighs 240 pounds. Claim ant attended the 8 grade and does have a GED. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills. Claimant testif ied that he was in special education in school.
- 7. Claimant last worke d in 201 0 at testified he has also worked watching trucks for a relative and at
- 8. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: degenerative disc disease, depression, and neck pain.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal 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 State Disability A ssistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Service s (DHS or department) admin isters the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department polic ies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the C ode 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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance 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

A set order is used to deter mine disability . Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past wor k, 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 experienc e. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impair ments do not signific antly limit physica I or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disab ility does not exist. Age, education and work ex perience will not be c onsidered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings wh ich demonstrate a medical im pairment.... 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 press ure, X-rays);
- Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on it s 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 bas ic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities with out 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).

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

All of the evidenc e relevant to the claim, including m edical opinions, is rev iewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decis ion about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other ev idence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical s ource finding t hat an individual is "d isabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability e xists for the purposes of the program. 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 <u>not</u> required. These steps are:

- 1. Does the client perf orm S ubstantial 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 cli ent is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis c ontinues to Step 3. 20 CF R 416.920(c).
- 3. Does the impairment appear on a spec ial listing of impairments or are the cli ent's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least eq uivalent in s everity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analys is 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 t he 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).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence e on the record indicates that claimant testified on the record that he lives with his wife in a community house and that he is married with no children under 18 who live with him. Claimant has no income and does receive Food Assistance Program benefits and the Adult Medical Program benefits. Claimant does have a driver's license and drest work times a month to the grocerence y store. Claimant testified that his wife does the cook ing, grocery shopping and cleaning, and he does no outside work. Claim ant testified that he plays computer games for 12 hours per day, watches television 6-7 hours per day and reads the bible as a hobby. Claimant testified that he can stand for 5-10 minutes at a time, sit for 20 minutes at a time and walk for 1 block. Claimant testified that he needs help dressing, he cannot squat, tie his shoes or touch his toes and he can bend at the waist a little and he has pain in his knees. Claimant testified that he is right handed, he has a rash on his hands

and arms otherwise t hey are fine and his legs/feet are fine. CI aimant testified that his level of pain, on a scale of 1-10, without medication is an 8-9, and wit h medication is a 5-6. Claimant testified that the heaviest weight he can carry is 5-10 lbs and he can briefly engage in sexual relations because of lung problems and that he doesn't smoke, drink or take any drugs. Claimant testified that on a typical day he gets up and uses t he bathroom, eats and goes back to sleep, and stays in bed mo st of the day. Claimant testified he was hospitalized for blood clots in his legs in October, 2012.

ex amination r eport dated January 23, 2013 Α indicates claimant was aler t, oriented and in no acute dist ress. He was walking with a normal gait. He did not have any difficulty getting on and off the examining table. He was not able to fully bend ov er. He was no able to squat or kneel down and he was not able to walk on his heels and on his toes. His weight was 244 lbs, height 5'10", blood pressure 110/80 and pulse 70. His head was normocephalic. His eyes, his pupils equal, reactive to light and accommodation. In t he ears the tympanic membrane was intact The throat was not congested. The neck was not stiff. No adenopathy. NO caroti d bruits. There is minimal tenderness over the cervical spine and mild decreased range of motion in all directions. The lungs had normal breathing so unds. No rales, rhonci or wheezing. Cardiovascular: heart normal si nus rhythm. Normal S1 and S2 without S3. abdomen was obese, soft, non tender. No No palp able heaves or thrill. The organomegaly. The back with lum bar spine tenderness. Straight leg raising plus 30° on both sides. The extremities had no pedal edema. No joint deformity. In the neurological area the patient was alert, oriented times three. Cranial nerves intact. There is no motor or sensory deficit. Deep tendon reflexes plus two bilaterally and symmetrical. The impression was neck pain due to degener ative disc disease an d back pain due to degenerative disc disease, possible herniat ed dis c aggravated by overweight and depression (p 38). A psychiatr ic evaluation dated Ma rch 23, 20 12 indicates claimant was diagnosed with depressive disorder and an Axis V GAF of 40. Axis IV indic ated economic problems, educatio nal problems, occupational problems, problem wit h primary support group, and other psychosocial and environmental problems (p 24).

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishi ng that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. in multiple areas of his Claimant has reports of pain body; however, there are no corresponding clinic al findings that suppor t the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no labor atory or x-ray findings listed in the file whic h support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impre ssion is that claimant is stable. There is no m edical finding that claim ant has any muscle at rophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is c onsistent with a deteriorating c ondition. In short, claimant has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational func tioning based upon his reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has me t the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Admini strative Law Judge finds th at the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges the following disabling mental impairments: depression because of his inability to do the things he wants to do and the things he used to do.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations ar e assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental di sorders (descriptions of restrict ions of activities of daily living, social functioning; c oncentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerat e increased mental demands associated wit h competitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/ps ychiatric e vidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations . There is a no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is in sufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it w ould prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was or iented to time, person and plac e during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questi ons at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiar y record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impair ment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at thi s step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidenc e of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon hi s ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no ev idence upon which this Admin istrative Law Judge c ould base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied a gain at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will constitue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capac ity is what an individual can do desp ite 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 class ify 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. Sedentary work involves lifting no more t han 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles lik e docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one whic h 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. Light wor k 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 categor y 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).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objecti ve medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Claimant has failed to pr ovide the necessary objective m edical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of im pairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 mont hs. The claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/ps ychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it w ould prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive t o the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and plac e during the hearing. Claimant's c omplaints of pain, while pr ofound and credi ble, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence c ontained in t he file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establis h that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Clai mant is dis qualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not establis hed by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 47), with a high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

The department's Program Elig ibility Manual contains the following policy s tatements and instructions for casework ers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assist ance, a person must be dis abled, caring for a disable d person or age 65 or older. BEM , Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled u nder the MA-P program and becaus e the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable t o work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability cr iteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that claimant was not eligible to receive Medi cal As sistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law, decides that the depar tment has appropriately establis hed on the rec ord that it was acting in compliance wit h department policy when it deni ed claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medica I Assistance and Stat e Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department policy ent has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Landis

/s/

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

Date Signed: <u>APRIL 23, 2013</u>

Date Mailed: APRIL 24, 2013

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> 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 erro r, 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/las

