

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-41413
Issue No.: 2009; 4031
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 4, 2013
County: Genesee 02

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. Spodarek

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. Claimant appeared on behalf of herself. The DHS was represented in part by Ms. [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) application?

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 1-2-13, Claimant re-applied for MA and SDA with the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS). Claimant's file indicate that Claimant previously filed on 6-12-11; 3-27-09; and 2-8-08. Claimant was denied all three prior applications by the MRT.
2. In the instant case, Claimant applied for 3 months of retro MA.
3. On 3-22-13, the MRT denied.
4. On 4-15-13, the DHS issued notice.
5. On 4-15-13, Claimant filed a hearing request.
6. On 7-23-13, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) denied Claimant.

7. Claimant has been denied SSI by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Claimant went before a federal ALJ and received an unfavorable decision on 7-19-12. Claimant subsequently appealed to the Appeals Council, which is pending.
8. Claimant is a 48-year-old female, standing 5'9" tall and weighing 215 pounds. Claimant's BMI classifies Claimant as obese.
9. Claimant has an alcohol/drug abuse history.
10. Claimant has a driver's license and can drive an automobile.
11. Claimant has an 8th grade education.
12. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in 2009. Claimant was subsequently incarcerated.
13. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of DDD, depression, plantar fasciitis, and interstitial cystitis.
14. The 7-23-13 SHRT findings and conclusions of its decision are adopted and incorporated by reference herein.
15. 1/10/13 physical exam reports Claimant weighs 230 pounds with height of 5'5". Positive muscle spasms noted in the lumbar spine, Tenderness of the plantar fasciitis. Negative straight leg raising. X-ray of lumbar spine showed DDD.
16. Mental status evaluation on 1/28/12 noted mental status coherent, relevant and spontaneous. Mood anxious and frustrated. Thoughts well organized and well processed. Fully oriented. Memory intact.
17. Physical evaluation of 6-28-11 indicates normal eval except for musculo-skeletal: "obese, pain with ROM testing of spine." Claimant can meet her needs in the home.
18. A Medical Needs form on Exhibit 115 indicates that claimant is ambulatory, does not need special transportation, and does not need any assistance with her needs in the home.
19. Exhibit 168 indicates that Claimant is able to perform usual and customary activities including occupational duties without any restrictions.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Statutory authority for the SDA program states in part:

- (b) A person with a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards, except that the minimum duration of the disability shall be 90 days. Substance abuse alone is not defined as a basis for eligibility.

In order to receive MA benefits based upon disability or blindness, Claimant must be disabled or blind as defined in Title XVI of the Social Security Act (20 CFR 416.901). DHS, being authorized to make such disability determinations, utilizes the SSI definition of disability when making medical decisions on MA applications. MA-P (disability), also known as Medicaid, which is a program designated to help public assistance Claimants pay their medical expenses. Michigan administers the federal Medicaid program. In assessing eligibility, Michigan utilizes the federal regulations.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

"Disability" is:

...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.

The federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

...We follow a set order to determine whether you 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.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

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 medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b). If no, the analysis continues to Step 2.
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 416.909(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 that meets the duration requirement? 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. Sections 200.00-204.00(f)?
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? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do other work. If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application Claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to:

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required by Claimant to establish statutory disability. The regulations essentially require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate Claimant's claims or Claimant's physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

...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 sure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

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

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

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.
- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques. Psychiatric signs are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological

abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated.

- (c) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

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

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques....
20 CFR 416.927(a)(1).

It is noted that Congress removed obesity from the Listing of Impairments shortly after the removal of drug addiction and alcoholism. This removal reflects the view that there is a strong behavioral component to obesity. Thus, obesity in-and-of itself is not sufficient to show statutory disability.

Applying the sequential analysis herein, Claimant is not eligible at the first step as Claimant is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). This second step is a *de minimus* standard. Ruling any ambiguities in Claimant's favor, this Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that Claimant meets both. The analysis continues.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meets or equals one of the Listings of Impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Claimant does not. The analysis continues.

The fourth step of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by Claimant in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

In this case, this ALJ finds that Claimant cannot return to past relevant work on the basis of the medical evidence. The analysis continues.

The fifth and final step of the analysis applies the biographical data of the applicant to the Medical Vocational Grids to determine the residual functional capacity of the applicant to do other work. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge concurs with the SHRT decision in finding Claimant not disable pursuant to medical vocational grid rule 202.17 as a guide.

In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that The 6th Circuit has held that subjective complaints are inadequate to establish disability when the objective evidence fails to establish the existence of severity of the alleged pain. *McCormick v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 861 F2d 998, 1003 (6th cir 1988).

Claimant has the burden of proof from Step 1 to Step 4. 20CFR 416.912(c). Federal and state law is quite specific with regards to the type of evidence sufficient to show statutory disability. 20 CFR 416.913. This authority requires sufficient medical evidence to substantiate and corroborate statutory disability as it is defined under federal and state law. 20 CFR 416.913(b), .913(d), and .913(e); BEM 260. These medical findings must be corroborated by medical tests, labs, and other corroborating medical evidence that substantiates disability. 20 CFR 416.927, .928. Moreover, complaints and symptoms of pain must be corroborated pursuant to 20 CFR 416.929(a), .929(c)(4), and .945(e). Claimant's medical evidence in this case, taken as a whole, simply does not rise to statutory disability by meeting these federal and state requirements. 20 CFR 416.920; BEM 260, 261.

It is further noted that it is noted that claimant's smoking and/or obesity are the "individual responsibility" types of behaviors reflected in the *SIAS v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 861 F2d 475 (6th cir 1988) decision. In *SIAS*, the claimant was an obese, heavy smoker who argued that he could not afford support hose prescribed by

his doctor for acute thrombophlebitis. The doctor also advised claimant to reduce his body weight. The court said in part:

...The claimant's style of life is not consistent with that of a person who suffers from intractable pain or who believes his condition could develop into a very quick life-threatening situation. The claimant admitted to the ALJ he was at least 40 pounds overweight; ignoring the instructions of his physician, he has not lost weight.

...The Social Security Act did not repeal the principle of individual responsibility. Each of us faces myriads of choices in life, and the choices we make, whether we like it or not, have consequences. If the claimant in this case chooses to drive himself to an early grave, that is his privilege—but if he is not truly disabled, he has no right to require those who pay Social Security taxes to help underwrite the cost of his ride. *SIAS*, supra, p. 481.

In *SIAS*, the claimant was found not truly disabled because the secretary disregarded the consequences resulting from the claimant's unhealthy habits and lifestyles—including the failure to stop smoking. *AWAD v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 734 F.2d 288, 289-90 (6th cir 1984).

Statutory disability does not recognize many behaviors as statutorily disabling where behavioral driven treatment will remove or reduce the severity of complaint. Among others, this includes complaints such as drug and alcohol addiction, obesity, and smoking. Issues related to these problems often result from lifestyle choices. In addition, many heart problems, type 2 diabetes, neuropathy, and high cholesterol have been significantly correlated with many lifestyle behaviors. In such instances, the symptoms and problem are treatable—obesity is treatable with weight loss, diet and exercise; alcoholism and drug addiction with abstinence; lung/breathing related medical issues are treatable with cessation from smoking. As with the congressional mandate denying statutory disability for alcohol and drug addiction, individual behaviors that drive medically related complaints and symptoms are not considered under the federal social security law as "truly disabling" see *SIAS*. In most instances, standard medical protocol is to instruct the individual to stop consuming alcohol, stop the drug addiction, stop smoking, and to lose weight. In fact, 20 CFR 416.930 requires a finding of not disabled where an individual fails to follow the recommended or prescribed treatment program.

It is also noted that Claimant could be found not disabled on the basis of 20 CFR 416.930 pursuant to Exhibit 47.

It is also noted that some of the check boxes checked off on the DHS 49 and DHS 54A would lead to the conclusion that Claimant cannot work. However, under the issues and considerations found at 20 CFR 416. 927, these are considered unsupported conclusions and cannot be given substantial weight.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department's actions were correct.

Accordingly, the department's determination in this matter is **UPHELD**.

Janice	<u>/s/</u> _____ G. Spodarek Administrative Law Judge for Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services
--------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Date Signed: October 23, 2013

Date Mailed: October 23, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) 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. MAHS 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. (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 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant,
 - failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

2013-41413/JGS

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at
Michigan Administrative Hearings
Recons ideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

JGS/tb

cc:

