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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 20136221 Issue No: 2009

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 witness, and each testified. The Department was represented by

## <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly close Claim ant's Medical Ass istance (MA-P) program benefits because she is no longer disabled?

# 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 was an ongoing recipient of MA-P benefits.
- 2. In the Medical Review Team ("MRT") fo und the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program.
- 3. In the Department reviewed the Claimant's eligibility.
- 4. On the MRT found the Claimant no longer disabled based upon medical improvement.
- 5. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
- 6. On written request for hearing.

- 7. The Claim ant has physical disab ling impairments including hy pertension and anal cancer.
- 8. The Claimant completed high school.
- 9. Claimant has had medical improvement in her condition.
- 10. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
  - i. Sitting: 30 minutes
  - ii. Standing: 60 minutes
  - iii. Walking: 100 feet
  - iv. Bend/stoop: no difficulty
  - v. Lifting: 10 lbs.
  - vi. Grip/grasp: no limitations
- 11. Claimant is 53 years old.
- 12. Claimant takes the following prescription medications:
  - а.
- 13. The State Hearing Rev iew Team denied Claimant's appeal on because the medical evidence of record does not document a mental/physica I impairment that sign ificantly limits the Claimant's ability to perform basic work activities.
- 14. Claimant is working as a care giver at an adult foster care facility 24 hours per week earning **\$** per hour which totals **\$** per month.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance ("MA") program is est ablished by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services ("DHS"), formerly known as the Family Independ ence Agency, pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq* and MCL 400.105. Department polic ies are found in t he Bridges Administrative Manual ("BAM"), the Bridge s Eligibility Manual ("BEM"), and the Bridges Reference Manual ("BRM").

Disability is defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental im pairment 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). The person claimi ng a physical or mental disability has the burden to esta blish it through the use of competent medical evidenc e from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescri bed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical

assessment of ability to do work-relate activities o r ability to reason a nd make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disab ility is alleged. 20 CRF 413 .913. An individual's subjective pain com plaints ar e not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disab ility. 20 CF R 416.908; 2 0 CFR 4 16.929(a). Similarly, conclusor y statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

When determining disability, t he federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/du ration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicants takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the e ffect of the applic ant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3). The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2).

Once an individual has been found disabled for purposes of MA benefit s, continued entitlement is periodically reviewed in order to make a current determination or decision as to whether disability remains in accordance with the medical improvement review standard. 20 CF R 416.993(a); 20 CFR 416.994. In evaluating a claim for ongoing MA benefits, federal regulations require a sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5). The review may cease and benefits continued if sufficient evidence supports a finding that an individual is st ill unable to engage in substantial gainful activity. *Id.* Prior to decid ing an individual's disability has end ed, the de partment will develop, along with the Claimant's cooperation, a complete medical history covering at least the 12 months preceding the date the individual signed a request seeking continuing disability benefits. 20 CF R 416.993(b). The department may order a consultative examination to determine whether or not the disability continues. 20 CFR 416.993(c).

The first step in the analysis in determining w hether an individual's disability has ended requires the trier of fact to consider the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets or equals a list ed impairment in App endix 1 of subpart P of part 404 of Chapter 20. 20 CF R 416.994(b)(5)(i). If a Listing is met, an individual's disability is f ound to continue with no further analysis required.

If the impairment(s) does not meet or equal a Listing, then Step 2 requires a determination of whet her there has been m edical improvement as defined in 20 CF R 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b) ((5)(ii). Medical improvement is defined as any decrease in the medical severity of the impa irment(s) which was present at the time of the most favorable medical dec ision that the individual was disabled or continues to be disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i). If no medical improvement found, and no exception applies (see listed exceptions below), then an individual's disability is found to continue. Conversely, if medical improvement is found, Step 3 calls for a determination of whether there has been an increase in the residual functional capacity ("RFC") based on the

impairment(s) that were pr esent at the time of t he determination. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iii).

he most favorable medical

If medical improvement is not related to t he ability to work, Step 4 evalua tes whether any listed exception applies. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(i v). If no exception is applicable, disability is found to continue. ld. If the medical improvement is related to an individual's ability to do work, then a det ermination of whether an individual's impairment(s) are severe is made. 20 CFR 416. 994(b)(5)(iii), (v). If severe, an assessment of an individual's residual functional capacity to perform past work is made. 20 CF R 416.994(b)(5)(vi). If an individual can perform past relevant work , disability does not continue. *Id.* Similarly, when evidence establis hes that the impairment(s) do (does) not signific antly limit an individual's physical or mental abilities to do basic work activities, continuing disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(v). Finally, if an individual is unable t o perform past relevant work, vocational factors such as the individual's age, educ ation, and past work ex perience are considered in determining whether despite the lim itations an individual is able t o perform other work. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vii). Disability ends if an individual is able to perform other work. *Id.* 

The first group of exc eptions (as mentioned above) to medical improvement (i.e., when disability c an be found to have ended e ven though medical improvement has not occurred) found in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(3) are as follows:

- (i) Substantial evidence shows that the individual is the beneficiary of advances in medial or vocation al therapy or technology (related to the ability to work;
- Substantial evidence s hows that the individual has undergone vocational therapy re lated to the ability to work;
- Substantial evidence shows that based on new or improved diagnostic or evaluative techniques the impairment(s) is not as disabling as previously determined at the time of the most recent favorable decision;
- (iv) Substantial evidence dem onstrates that any prior disability decision was in error.

The second group of exceptions [20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)] to medical improvement are as follows:

- (i) A prior determination was fraudulently obtained;
- (ii) The individual failed to cooperated;
- (iii) The individual cannot be located;
- (iv) The presc ribed treatm ent that was expected to restore the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity was not followed.

If an exception from the second group listed above is applicable, a determination that the individual's disability has ended is made. 20 CF R 416.994(b)(5)(iv). The second group of exceptions to medica I improvement may be considered at any point in the process. *Id.* 

As disc ussed above, the first step in t he sequential evaluation process to determine whether the Claimant's disability continues I ooks at the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1.

At the time of the Claimant's initial approval, the Claimant had diagnoses of anal cancer. At the hearing Claimant's anal cancer was in remission and had been in remission for over a year.

In this case, the Claimant's anal cancer is in remission. Claimant's impairments do not meet or equal a listing. In light of the foregoing, a det ermination of whether the Claimant's condition has medically improved is necessary.

As noted above, the Claimant was previously found di sabled in comparing those medical records to the recent evidence (as detailed above), it is found that the Claimant's c ondition has medically improved accordingly, the Claimant's disability must be further evaluated u nder the sequential analysis. 20 CF R 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii).

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 Append ix 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. Se e Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR Part 404, Part A. Listing 13.18 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 t he Claimant within the past 15 y ears. The trier of fact must determine whet her the im pairment(s) presented prevent the Claimant from doing past relevant work. In the pr esent case, the Claimant 's past employment was as a care giver. Working as a c are giver would be considered light work. T his Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant is capable of light work and her previous employment.

The Department has met its burden proving that Cla imant has had medic al improvement that would warra is finding that she is no longer disabled for the purposes of MA-P.

### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusion s of law finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of continued MA-P benefits.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

The Department's det ermination is **AFFIRMED** and Claimant's M A-P benefits shall be processed for closure if not done so already.

Am militi

Aaron Administrative for Department

McClintic Law Judge Maura Corrigan, Director of Human Services

Date Signed: 03/21/2013

Date Mailed: 03/21/2013

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the receipt date of this Dec ision and Orde r. MAHS will not or der 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. (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 r ehearing 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.

### 20136221/AM

- A reconsideration <u>MAY</u> be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical e rror, 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

### AM/kl

