

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 2013-2964
Issue No: 2009;4031
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: January 24, 2013
Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Y. Lain

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. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 24, 2013. Claimant personally appeared and testified.

ISSUE

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 May 30, 2012, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, Retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
2. On September 5, 2012, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant could perform prior work.
3. On September 17, 2012, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that his application was denied.
4. On October 1, 2012, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
5. On December 4, 2012, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: the medical evidence supports that the claimant would reasonably retain the ability to perform light exertional tasks. The claimant is not currently

engaging in substantial gainful activity based on the information that is available in file. The claimant's impairments/combination of impairments does not meet/equal the intensity or severity of a Social Security Administration listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform light exertional tasks. The claimant's past work was as a sales associate, 211.462-014, 3L; and, apartment maintenance, 899.381-010, 7M. Therefore, the claimant retains the capacity to perform their past relevant work as a sales associate. MA-P is denied per 20CFR416.920 (e&f). Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per BEM 261 due to the capacity to perform past relevant work. Listings 1.04, 4.04, 11.4 and 12.09 were considered in this determination.

6. The hearing was held on January 24, 2013. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
7. The record was left open until February 24, 2013 for the submission of additional medical information. No new medical information was submitted and the record was closed February 28, 2013 and the Administrative Law Judge will proceed to decision.
8. Claimant is a 54-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 6'0" tall and weighs 197 pounds. Claimant is a high school graduate and has 2 years of college where he studied criminal justice and HVAC. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
9. Claimant last worked in 2001 for [REDACTED] [REDACTED] as maintenance. Claimant has also worked doing other cleaning and maintenance jobs.
10. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: coronary artery disease, alcohol abuse, heart attack, back pain, hypertension, and legs which give out. Claimant alleges no disabling mental impairments.

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 opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant 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 Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. Department policies 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 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 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 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 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 experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 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 pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its 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 basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without 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 acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

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).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists 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 not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial 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 special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(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 the 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 on the record indicates that claimant lives with his girlfriend who supports him and he is single with no children under 18 who live with him. Claimant has no income and does receive Food Assistance Program benefits. Claimant does not have a driver's license because he has 3 DUI's and he usually takes the bus one time per week or friends take him where he needs to go. Claimant testified that he cooks hot dogs rarely and his girlfriend usually grocery shops for him. Claimant testified that he does vacuum, sweep and does dishes and he watches television 3 hours per day. Claimant testified that he can stand for 1 hour at a time, sit for 1 hour at a time and walk 2 blocks. Claimant testified that he can shower and dress himself, tie his shoes while sitting and bend at the waist, but he cannot touch his toes or squat and his knees are fine. Claimant testified his level of pain, on a scale of 1-10, without medication is a 10, and with medications is a 7 and he is right handed and his hands/arms are fine and his legs/feet are fine. Claimant testified the heaviest weight he can carry is 30 lbs and he does smoke a pack of cigarettes per week, doctors have told him to quit and he is trying to quit. Claimant testified that he stopped drinking 4 months before the hearing and that he is a recovering alcoholic and that he stopped smoking marijuana. Claimant testified that on a typical day he does pain management and takes his medications.

A September 11, 2012 [REDACTED] Services examination indicates that claimant is 72" tall and weighed 194 lbs. Blood pressure 142/94, pulse 72, pulse ox 99%, respiratory rate 12. Visual acuity using the Snellen Standard Eye Chart is bilateral 20/20, right 20/20, left 20/20, without corrective lenses. The claimant is appropriately dresses and groomed with no evidence of personal hygiene neglect. Speech is fluent. Claimant follows simple and complex directions and commands without difficulty. Claimant is able to hear and understand normal conversational tones. Memory of recent and remote medical events is preserved. Intellectual function is grossly normal. The claimant is pleasant and cooperative to the examiner throughout this examination. The skin had no rashes, bruising, jaundice or other skin discolorations noted. The head is normocephalic, atraumatic. Sclerae are white and clear bilaterally. The oropharynx is clear without lesions or exudates. Dentition is in poor repair. Pupils are equal, round and reactive to light and accommodation. Extraocular muscles are intact. Red reflex is normal bilaterally. On funduscopic examination with poorly dilated pupils there is no evidence of hypertensive or diabetic retinopathy. Nasal passages are clear without discharge. The visual fields are normal by gross confrontation. Examination of the neck reveals no thyromegaly, lymphadenopathy or other palpable masses. Carotid pulses are present, symmetrical and normal. There are no carotid bruits. No rigidity noted. In the chest/lungs there is no thoracic kyphosis. On examination of the chest there is symmetrical excursion. There is no increased A/P diameter and no accessory muscle use. There is no chest wall tenderness to palpation. The lung fields are clear to auscultation and percussion, without wheezes, crackles, rales or rhonchi. There is no increased expiratory phase of respiration. The cardiovascular area examination of the heart reveals a regular rate and rhythm. S1 and

S2 are normal. There is no apparent murmur, rub or gallop. The PMI is normal in the fifth intercostal space at the mid clavicular line. The abdomen is soft, non tender, and non distended. There are normal bowel sounds heard. There are no abdominal bruits noted. There is no appreciable hepatosplenomegaly or ascites and there is no rebound, guarding or rigidity noted. The peripheral pulses are present and symmetrical. There is no evidence of peripheral artery insufficiency as evidenced by capillary refill of less than 2 seconds. There is no clubbing or cyanosis. There are no venous stasis changes such as pigmentation, ulceration or brawny edema. No pitting edema. On examination of the joints, there are no apparent rheumatoid nodules, ulnar deviation, capsular thickening, periarticular swelling or tophi. Examination of the dorsolumbar spine shows no apparent kyphosis or scoliosis. There is no paravertebral muscle spasm or tenderness to palpation of the spinous processes (p 61-62). Shoulder examination reveals no crepitus, tenderness, erythema, warmth, swelling or nodules. Hip examination reveals no tenderness or atrophy. Knee examination reveals no crepitus, tenderness, swelling, effusion, laxity or nodules (p 63). In the neurological area, claimant is alert and oriented times 3. Cranial nerves II through XII are grossly intact. Sensation is intact to light touch, and pinprick throughout. There is no evidence of muscle atrophy. No muscle fasciculations are noted. Motor strength is normal at 5/5. Cerebellar exam is normal. Romberg and Downward Drift are normal (p 64). The claimant is able to walk on heels and toes. Can tandem walk. Claimant can stand on either leg alone. Claimant ambulates with a normal gait, which is not a wide based gait, slapping gait, slow shuffling gait, unsteady, lurching or unpredictable. Claimant's gait is not compensated, and does not walk with a limp. Claimant is stable at station and appears comfortable in the seated positions. Straight leg raises are negative bilaterally in the seated positions. Clinical evidence does not support the need for a walking aid. The medical source statement was that claimant had chest pain, low back pain with radiculopathy and ethanol abuse. Based on the examination, claimant should be able to work 8 hours in a day. He should be able to work in a seated or standing position with regular breaks, with occasional walking. He should be able to push, pull, lift or carry 40 lbs frequently and 50 lbs occasionally. He should be able to use bilateral hands for fine and gross manipulation on reaching, handling, feeling, grasping, and fingering continuously. He has no limitations in climbing stairs. There are no driving limitations, no visual or communicative limitations (p 65-66). This Administrative Law Judge used all of the medical reports contained in the file when making this decision.

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she 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. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of his body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file which support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impression is that claimant is stable. There is no medical finding that claimant has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, claimant has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon

his reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges no disabling mental impairments.

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, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. 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 this 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 evidence 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 his ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could 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 again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue 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 capacity is what an individual can do despite 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 classify 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 than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which 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 work 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 category 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 objective 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 provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. 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/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the 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 establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a person closely approaching advanced age (age 54), with a more than high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

It should be noted that claimant continues to smoke despite the fact that his doctor has told him to quit. Claimant is not in compliance with his treatment program.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

The department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under 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 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 Medical Assistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied claimant's application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits. The claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The department 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: March 7, 2013

Date Mailed: March 7, 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 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 **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/las

cc:

