#### STATE OF MICHIGAN

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No: 201328288 Issue No: 2009; 4031 Case No:

Hearing Date:

June 19, 2013

**Branch County DHS** 

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: William A. Sundquist

### HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Cla imant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in person hearing was held on Wednesday; June 19, 2013. Claimant appeared an provided t estimony on his beh alf with . Participa nts on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

### ISSUE

Was disability, as defined below, medically established?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- Claimant's MA-P/SDA applicat ion Augus t 7, 2012 was denied on 1. December 10, 2012 per BEM 260/261, with a hearing request on January 28, 2013.
- factors: Age 39, with a 11 th grade educ ation, and unskilled 2. Vocational work experience.
- Claimant's last employment ended in May, 2012. 3.
- 4 Claimant's alleged dis abling symptoms: C annot focus and concentrate; tiredness from lack of being able to sleep; chronic weakness/pain in legs.
- 5. Cla imant alleged disabling medical dis order(s): Anxiety, depression, bipolar disorder, obesity, and sleep apnea. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 126).
- 6 Medical reports of exams state the claimant on:

October 26, 2011: Has intact crani al nerv es II-XII; that gait is *normal*. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 118).

February 15, 2012: Has a GAF score of 45. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 50).

October 2, 2012: Has a GAF score of 55. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 100).

October 16, 2012: Was cooperative in answering questions and following commands; that she appeared in mild discomfort; that Claimant's immediate, recent, and remote memory is intact with normal concentration; that her in sight and judgment are both appropriate; that there is no evidence of joint laxity, crepitance, of effusion; that grip strength remains intact; that dexterity is *unimpaired*; that she could pick up coin and open a door; that she had no difficulty getting on and off the examination table; *mild* difficulty heel and toe walking; mild difficulty squatting; mild difficult y hopping; that she h ad a *normal* range of motion for the cervical spine, dorsal lumbar spine, shoulders, elbows, hips, knees, ankles, wr ists, and hands-finger s; that she walked with a normal ga it. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 106-108).

November 29, 2012: I s not disabled and work ready with limitations; that she can lift/carry fre quently ten pounds and occasionally twenty-five pounds; that she can stand and/or walk fo r a total of six hours in a eight hour workday and sit about six hours in a eight hour workday; that she is limited to unskilled work; that she has the ability to understand, remember, and carry out simple instructions; that she can respond appropriately t o supervision, co-workers, and work pre ssures in routine work settings; and that she can make s imple work-related judgments and decis ions. (DHS Exhibit A, Pg. 96).

7. State Hearing Rev iew Team decision dated May 22, 2013 states the Claimant's impairments do not meet/equal a Social Se curity listing for the required duration. (DHS Exhibit A, Pq. 126).

# **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

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 policies are found in the Bridg es

#### 201328288/WAS

Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Elig ibility Manual (B EM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Facts above are undisputed.

### "Disability" is:

...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.

...We follow a set order to determine whether y ou are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

When determining disability, the federal regulations are used as a guideline and require that several considerations be analyzed in sequentia I order. If dis ability 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 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 spec ial listing of impairments or are the clie nt's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings spec ified for the listed im pairment? 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 anal ysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
- 5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform oth er work according to the guidelines set

forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpar t P, Appendix 2, Sec tions 200.00-204.00? If yes, the anal ysis ends and the c lient is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

The claimant had the burden of proof to establish disability in accordance with steps 1-4 above... 20CFR 416.912 (a). The burden of proof shifts to the DHS at Step 5... 20CFR 416.960 (c)(2).

[In reviewing your impairment]...We need reports about your impairments from acceptable m edical sources.... 20 CFR 416.913(a).

Acceptable medical verification sources are licensed physicians, osteopaths, or certified psychologists ...20CFR 416.913(a)

...The med ical evidence...mus t be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

It must allow us to determine --

- (1) The nature and limiting effe cts of your impairment(s) for any period in question;
- (2) The probable duration of your impairment; and
- (3) Your residual functional capac ity to do w ork-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

### Step 1

...If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your m edical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b).

The evidence of record established that the claimant has not engaged in substantial gainful activity since May, 2012. Therefore, the sequential evaluation is required to continue to the next step.

#### Step 2

... [The re cord must show a severe impairment] which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities.... 20 CFR 416.920(c).

**Basic w ork activities.** When we talk about basic work activities, we mean the abilities and aptitudes neces sary 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;
- 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).

**Non-severe impairment(s)**. An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not signific antly limit your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a).

...If you do not have any impairment or combination of impairments which significantly limits your physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, we will find that you do not have a severe impairment and are, therefore, not di sabled. We will not consider your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

The medic al reports of record are mostly examination, diagnostic, treatment and progress reports. They do not provide medical assessments of Claimant's basic work limitations for the required duration. Stated differently, the medical reports do not establish whether the Claimant is impaired minimally, mildly, moderately (non-severe impairment, as defined above) or severely, as defined above for a one year continuous duration.

The claimants disabling symptoms (Findings of Fact #4) are inconsistent with the objective medical evidence of record (Findings of Fact #6).

...Your sy mptoms, i ncluding pain, will be determined t o diminish your capacity for basic work activities...to the extent that your alleged functional limitations and restrictions due to symptoms, such as pain, can reasonably be accepted as consistent with the objective medical evidence and other evidence. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(4).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which s how that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

Claimant had a GAF score of 45 in February, 2012 and 55 in October, 2012. 45 is considered a severe mental impairment with occ upational-functioning and 55 a moderate (not severe) impairment with occupational-functioning. DSM IV (4 <sup>th</sup> edition-revised).

The medic all evidence of record has not established the Claimant's abnormal mental findings have persisted on a regular and continuing basis on repeated examinations for a reasonable presumption to be made that a severe mental impairment has lasted or is expected to last for at least a one year continuous duration.

The medic al reports (Findings of Fact #6) state that Claimant's examinations were within normal limitations; that his impairments were minimal to moderate (not severe); and that his condition is stable (not deteriorating).

The Claimant has not sustained his bur den of proof to establis h a seve re physical/mental impairment in combination, instead of a non-severe impairment, for the required one year continuous duration.

Therefore, the sequential evaluation is required to stop at Step 2.

The department's Bridges Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability As sistance 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 because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the claimant does not meet the disability criteria for Stat e Disability Assistance benefits either.

Therefore, medical disability has not been established at Step 2 by the competent material and substantial evidence on the whole record.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusion sof law, decides disability was not medically established.

Accordingly, MA-P denial is **UPHELD** and so ORDERED.

<u>/s/</u>

William A. Sundquist Administrative Law Judge For Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 19, 2013

Date Mailed: June 20, 2013

**NOTICE**: Administrative Hearings may or der a re hearing 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 Hear ings will not orde rarehearing 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 ti mely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

WAS/hj

CC:

