

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-13358
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: May 1, 2013
County: Shiawassee

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge upon Claimant's request for a hearing made pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.9 and 400.37, which govern the administrative hearing and appeal process. After due notice, a telephone hearing was commenced on May 1, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) include Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED] and Family Independence Manager [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Whether the Department of Human Services (the department) properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and Retroactive Medical Assistance (Retro-MA) benefits?

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 August 10, 2012, Claimant filed an application for MA and Retro-MA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) On November 8, 2012, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro-MA indicating Claimant was capable of performing other work. (Depart Ex. A, pp 1-2).
- (3) On November 14, 2012, the department sent out notice to Claimant that her application for Medicaid had been denied.

- (4) On November 26, 2012, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
- (5) On January 16, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the denial of MA-P and Retro-MA benefits indicating the medical evidence of record indicates Claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of simple, unskilled work avoiding hazards such as unprotected heights and dangerous moving machinery. (Depart Ex. B, pp 1-2).
- (6) Claimant has a history of juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, migraines, depression, anxiety, and panic attacks.
- (7) Claimant is a 23 year old woman whose birthday is [REDACTED] Claimant is 5'2" tall and weighs 122 lbs. Claimant completed high school.
- (8) Claimant had applied for Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department, (DHS or department), 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 Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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). The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish it through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a). Similarly, conclusory 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, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicant takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment other than pain medication that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and, (4) the effect of the applicant'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).

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1). The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (e.g., age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945.

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from Step 3 to Step 4. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both Steps 4 and 5. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a). An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity. Therefore, she is not disqualified from receiving disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the individual's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The individual bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b). Examples 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. *Id.*

The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985).

In the present case, Claimant alleges disability due to juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, migraines, depression, anxiety, and panic attacks.

On May 15, 2012, Claimant followed up with her treating neurologist after having a baby the previous week. Claimant stated she had some jerking the night before. The onset of seizures was variable and she has been having seizures for the past 6 years. The seizures are preceded by aura and usually followed by a headache. The symptoms have been associated with a history of epilepsy. Claimant's posture was normal. She was alert and oriented time three. Her speech was fluent and coherent. She responded to questions and commands appropriately. She had a normal spine, rib, pelvis bilateral upper and lower extremity exam. There was no evidence of atrophy or spasms. The neurologist opined that Claimant was doing much better since the addition of Vimpat to her Keppra. She delivered a healthy baby girl last week. She will return in six months or sooner should her seizures worsen.

On July 28, 2012, Claimant had a psychiatric medication review. Claimant's gait was normal. Her expression, thought content, speech and language, and behavior were normal. Her affect was anxious. Her self-esteem was low. She stated the Judge was very angry with her. Her intellect and memory were normal. Diagnosis: Axis I: Major Depression, Recurrent, Moderate; Axis III: None; Axis IV: Claimant traumatized by court proceedings; Axis V: GAF=55.

On August 1, 2012, Claimant presented to her primary care physician with a complaint of bloody stools, lower back pain, and right hip pain.

On August 17, 2012, Claimant was evaluated for physical therapy. She has a history of neck and thoracic pain since a whiplash type injury playing soccer in 2006. She has persistent neck spasms with jerking and numbness on the left side of her body which led to the diagnosis of epilepsy. All of those symptoms have resolved. A year ago her neck and thoracic pain restarted and moved into her lower back. Pregnancy made her lower back symptoms worse. Since giving birth, her symptoms have continued to worsen. She had an elevated right shoulder and pelvis and rounded shoulders. She had poor spinal alignment with a short right lower extremity. She reported acute pain, 4/10 with 10/10 spasm type pains. She had right joint pain and left hip pain, with decreased trunk range of motion and decreased core strength.

On June 6, 2013, Claimant's neurologist completed a medical examination report based on his last examination of Claimant on May 6, 2013. Claimant was diagnosed with juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, insomnia and bipolar disorder. Claimant's general appearance, respiratory, cardiovascular, abdominal, musculoskeletal and neurological examinations were normal. Claimant was noted to be anxious and depressed. The neurologist based his opinions on an MRI of the brain and EEG. The neurologist indicated that Claimant's condition was stable but problematic; however, she had no physical limitations. The neurologist opined Claimant could frequently lift 25 pounds or more. The neurologist indicated that Claimant had refractory epilepsy with multiple seizure types that was very challenging to treat. The neurologist opined that Claimant does have mental limitations concerning sustained concentration and that it was her anxiety and insomnia that were leading to poor concentration.

As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). As summarized above, Claimant has presented some limited medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the individual's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. Claimant has alleged physical and mental disabling impairments due to juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, migraines, depression, anxiety, and panic attacks.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 11.00 (neurological), and Listing 12.00 (mental disorders), were considered in light of the objective evidence. Based on the foregoing, it is found that Claimant's impairment(s) does not meet the intent and severity

requirement of a listed impairment; therefore, Claimant cannot be found disabled at Step 3. Accordingly, Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1). Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy are not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s) and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

Claimant has no work history. As such, there is no past work for Claimant to perform, nor are there past work skills to transfer to other work occupations. Accordingly, Step 5 of the sequential analysis is required.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity and age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v). At the time of hearing, Claimant was 23 years old and was, thus, considered to be a younger individual for MA-P purposes. Claimant has a high school education. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.* At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from Claimant to the Department to present proof that Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983). The age for younger individuals (under 50) generally will not seriously affect the ability to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.963(c).

In this case, the evidence reveals that Claimant suffers from juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, migraines, depression, anxiety, and panic attacks. The objective medical evidence notes only mental limitations in sustained concentration. Claimant testified that she is able to walk 4-5 blocks and can lift/carry approximately 30 to 35 pounds. In light of the foregoing, it is found that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis which includes the ability to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform at least light work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(b). After review of the entire record using the Medical-Vocational

Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 202.20, it is found that Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.

Vicki L. Armstrong
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 22, 2013

Date Mailed: July 22, 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.

The following claimants have 3 way hearings scheduled. Please call in at the correct time to let Administrative Hearings know you are ready to proceed.

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.

2013-13358/VLA

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

VLA/las

cc:

