

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████
██████████
██████████

Reg. No.: 2013-24837
Issue No.: 2009, 4031
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: May 30, 2013
County: Wayne (43)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

HEARING DECISION

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a hearing was conducted in Highland Park, Michigan on May 30, 2013. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████, ES.

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received, reviewed, and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) for consideration. On November 13, 2013, this office received the SHRT determination which found Claimant not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit programs.

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P and SDA benefits on October 9, 2012.
2. On January 11, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not disabled.
3. The Department notified Claimant of the MRT determination on January 16, 2013.
4. On January 17, 2013, the Department received Claimant's timely written request for hearing.
5. On March 26, 2013, SHRT found Claimant not disabled for purposes of MA-P, but disabled for purposes of SDA for a limited period from October of 2012 to March of 2013. (Exhibit 2)
6. During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received at the hearing, reviewed, and forwarded to SHRT for consideration. On November 13, 2013, this office received the SHRT determination, which found Claimant not disabled.
7. At the time of the hearing, the Claimant was 34 years old with a birth date of [REDACTED]
8. Claimant has a 9th grade education.
9. Claimant is not currently working.
10. Claimant was diagnosed with a chronic complete tear anterior cruciate ligament, old healed sprain medial collateral ligament and possible iliotibial band friction syndrome. (Exhibit 1, p. 16) Claimant underwent surgery, right and left knee ACL reconstruction. (Exhibit 3) Claimant was not able to ambulate effectively as of July 3, 2013. (Exhibit B, p. 7)
11. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of twelve months or longer.
12. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who is so impaired as to be incapable of engaging in any substantial gainful activity on a regular and continuing basis.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance program is established by Subchapter XIX of Chapter 7 of The Public Health & Welfare Act, 42 USC 1397, and is administered by the Department of Human Services, formerly known as the Family Independence Agency, 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 Tables (“RFT”).

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition for “disabled” as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

“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.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), statutory listings of medical impairments, residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is or is not disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. (SGA) 20 CFR 416.920(b).

In this case, Claimant is not currently working. Claimant testified credibly that he is not currently working and the Department presented no contradictory evidence. Therefore, Claimant is not disqualified for MA at this step in the sequential evaluation process.

Second, in order to be considered disabled for purposes of MA, a person must have a severe impairment. 20 CFR 416.920(c). A severe impairment is an impairment expected to last twelve months or more (or result in death) which significantly limits an individual’s physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. The term “basic work activities” means 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).

The purpose of the second step in the sequential evaluation process is to screen out claims lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v. Bowen* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir, 1988). As a result, the Department may only screen out claims at this level which are “totally groundless” solely from a medical standpoint. The *Higgs* court used the severity requirement as a “*de minimus* hurdle” in the disability determination. The *de minimus* standard is a provision of a law that allows the court to disregard trifling matters.

In this case, medical evidence has clearly established that Claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on Claimant’s work activities. Claimant was diagnosed with a chronic complete tear anterior cruciate ligament, old healed sprain medial collateral ligament and possible iliotibial band friction syndrome. (Exhibit 1, p. 16) Claimant underwent surgery, right and left knee ACL reconstruction. (Exhibit 3) Claimant was not able to ambulate effectively as of July 3, 2013

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant’s impairment, or combination of impairments, meets or medically equals the criteria of an impairment listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. (20 CFR 416.920 (d), 416.925, and 416.926.) This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant’s medical record will support a finding that Claimant’s impairment(s) is a “listed impairment” or is medically equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404, Part A.

In the present case, Claimant has alleged disability due to *inter alia* torn ligaments in knee.

Listing 1.00 defines musculoskeletal system impairments. Disorders of the musculoskeletal system may result from hereditary, congenital, or acquired pathologic processes. 1.00A Impairments may result from infectious, inflammatory, or degenerative processes, traumatic or developmental events, or neoplastic, vascular, or toxic/metabolic diseases. 1.00A Regardless of the cause(s) of a musculoskeletal impairment, functional loss for purposes of these listings is defined as the inability to ambulate effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment, or the inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively on a sustained basis for any reason, including pain associated with the underlying musculoskeletal impairment. Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. 1.00B2b(1) Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity function to permit independent ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s) that limits the functioning of both upper extremities. (Listing 1.05C is an exception to this general definition because the individual has the use of only one upper extremity due to amputation of a hand.) *Id.* To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to be able to carry out activities of daily living. 1.00B2b(2) They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. . . . *Id.* When an individual's impairment involves a lower extremity uses a hand-held assistive device, such as a cane, crutch or walker, the medical basis for use of the device should be documented. 1.00J4 The requirement to use a hand-held assistive device may also impact an individual's functional capacity by virtue of the fact that one or both upper extremities are not available for such activities as lifting, carrying, pushing, and pulling. *Id.*

Categories of Musculoskeletal include:

1.03 *Reconstructive surgery or surgical arthrodesis of a major weight-bearing joint*, with inability to ambulate effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b, and return to effective ambulation did not occur, or is not expected to occur, within 12 months of onset.

To ambulate effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining a reasonable walking pace over a sufficient distance to be able to carry out activities of daily living. They must have the ability to travel without companion assistance to and from a place of employment or school. Therefore, examples of ineffective ambulation include, but are not limited to, the inability to walk without the use of a walker, two crutches or two canes, the inability to walk a block at a reasonable pace on rough or uneven surfaces, the inability to use standard public transportation, the inability to carry out routine ambulatory activities, such as shopping and banking, and the inability to climb a few steps at a reasonable pace with the use of a single hand rail. The ability to walk

independently about one's home without the use of assistive devices does not, in and of itself, constitute effective ambulation.

In this case, the objective evidence reveals that Claimant had a chronic complete tear anterior cruciate ligament, old healed sprain medial collateral ligament and possible iliotibial band friction syndrome. (Exhibit 1, p. 16) Claimant underwent surgery, right and left knee ACL reconstruction. (Exhibit 3) Claimant was not able to ambulate effectively as of July 3, 2013, and was going to start physical therapy in the middle of July of 2013. (Exhibit B) Based on the medical evidence alone, the Claimant's impairment(s) meet, or are the medical equivalent thereof, a listing impairment within Listing 1.00 as detailed above. Accordingly, the Claimant is found disabled at Step 3 with no further analysis required.

The State Disability Assistance program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Michigan Administrative Code Rule 400.3151 – 400.3180. Department policies are found in BAM, BEM, and RFT. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal SSI disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of the MA-P program; therefore, he is found disabled for purposes of SDA benefit program.

DECISION AND ORDER


The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is REVERSED.
2. The Department shall initiate processing of the October 9, 2012 application to determine if all non-medical criteria are met and inform Claimant of the determination in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department shall reinstate Claimant's SDA case, effective March 24, 2013, and ongoing. (If the Department had closed Claimant's SDA case as of that date.)

2013-24837/SCB

4. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits that Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible, in accordance with Department policy.
5. The Department shall review Claimant's continued eligibility in January of 2015, in accordance with Department policy.



Susan C. Burke
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 19, 2013

Date Mailed: November 19, 2013

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

2013-24837/SCB

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SCB/tm

cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]