

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-43666
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 11, 2013
County: Jackson

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

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, an in-person hearing was held on September 11, 2013, at the Jackson County DHS office. Claimant, represented by Ms. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], personally appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Manager [REDACTED] and Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED].

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence. The new evidence was forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team ("SHRT") for consideration. On October 31, 2013, the SHRT found Claimant was not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (DHS) properly deny Claimant's Medical Assistance (MA) and Retro-MA 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 October 22, 2012, Claimant filed an application for MA/Retro-MA and SDA benefits alleging disability.
2. On January 29, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA/Retro-MA indicating his impairments lacked duration. SDA was approved. (Depart Ex. A, pp 4-5).

3. On February 1, 2013, the department caseworker sent Claimant notice that his application for MA/Retro-MA had been denied and SDA had been approved.
4. On April 24, 2013, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
5. On July 10, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) found the medical evidence of record indicates Claimant's condition has improved within 12 months from the date of onset. MA and Retro-MA are denied due to lack of duration. (Depart Ex. B, pp 1-2).
6. Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.
7. Claimant is a 48 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED] Claimant is 6'2" tall and weighs 340 lbs.
8. Claimant does have an alcohol, drug and nicotine abuse history. Claimant has not used any alcohol, drugs or nicotine since September, 2012.
9. Claimant does not have a driver's license due to owing fines.
10. Claimant has a high school education.
11. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in September, 2012.
12. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of a perforated colon, acute respiratory failure, basilar pneumonia, peritonitis with systemic inflammatory response syndrome and sepsis due to perforate colon, deep venous thrombosis of the right arm, atrial fibrillation which failed electrical cardioversion, gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD), congestive heart failure, small bowel obstruction, hernia, tendonitis, arthritis, degenerative joint disease, carpal tunnel syndrome and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).
13. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of twelve months or longer.
14. 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 (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 Bridges Reference Manual (RFT).

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, 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 ultrasounds, 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).

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).

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). See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once Claimant reaches Step 5 in the sequential review process, Claimant has already established a *prima facie* case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962 (6th Cir, 1984). At that point, the burden of proof is on the state to prove by substantial evidence that Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity.

The medical information indicates that Claimant suffered a perforated colon in September, 2012. Claimant underwent a laparotomy with left hemicolectomy and end colostomy with placement of a Jackson-Pratt drain. Claimant developed acute respiratory failure on the third hospital day and was intubated and began on mechanical ventilator support and moved to the critical care unit. He was felt to have systemic inflammatory response syndrome with early sepsis, and he also had atrial fibrillation with rapid ventricular response treated with IV Cardizem. He was treated with mechanical ventilator support, antibiotics, nutritional support and IV Cardizem alternating oral Cardizem as well as beta-blockers. He had some postoperative anemia and also multiple organ dysfunction and probable alcohol withdrawal. He had a low-grade fever persistently and follow-up CAT scans of the abdomen and pelvis showed some fluid in the left kidney bed where his previous nephrectomy had been performed for a nonfunctioning kidney. He was found to have a right arm deep vein thrombosis. He was on full dose Lovenox both for the DVT and for his atrial fibrillation. Claimant was transferred to CareLink on October 18, 2012, for acute respiratory failure requiring tracheostomy and mechanical ventilation for weaning.

Claimant was discharged from CareLink on November 8, 2012, with a final diagnosis of acute respiratory failure requiring tracheostomy and mechanical ventilation, bilateral pseudomonas aeruginosa pneumonia, large left pleural effusion, acute peritonitis, atrial fibrillation, deconditioning, COPD and a history of alcohol and substance abuse.

In August, 2013, Claimant saw his surgeon for follow-up of his original trauma and subsequent reversal of colostomy. He was doing well until three weeks prior to this appointment when he started to notice a bulge at the upper portion of his abdominal incision. Claimant was diagnosed with a recurrent hernia which is reducible but appears to be containing bowel. Due to the fact that Claimant has had multiple surgeries, a CT scan of the abdomen and pelvis was scheduled to rule out any other fascial defects. Claimant was instructed to wear his binder and to avoid heavy lifting (greater than 25 pounds) until further notice. Claimant's body mass index is greater than 40, hence the surgeon had difficulty examining Claimant due to his size.

Claimant testified credibly that he has limited tolerance for physical activities and is unable to walk or stand for lengthy periods of time. Claimant admitted that he cannot stand longer than 10-15 minutes due to back pain and cannot walk more than half a block due to shortness of breath and his racing heart.

Claimant has been medically described as morbidly obese with a body mass index greater than 40, which condition likely exacerbates his impairments.

Obesity is a medically determinable impairment that is often associated with disturbance of the respiratory system, and disturbance of this system can be a major cause of disability in individuals with obesity. The combined effects of obesity with respiratory impairments can be greater than the effects

of each of the impairment s considered separately. Therefore, when determining whether an individual with obesity has a listing-level impairment or combination of impairments, and when assessing a claim at other steps of the sequential evaluation process, including when assessing an individual's residual functional capacity, adjudicators must consider any additional and cumulative effects of obesity. Listing 3.00 I.

Claimant is 48 years old, with a high school education. Claimant's medical records are consistent with his testimony that he is unable to engage in even a full range of sedentary work on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 11, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986).

The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that given Claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which Claimant could perform despite Claimant's limitations. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program.


DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the department erred in determining Claimant is not currently disabled for MA/Retro-MA eligibility purposes.

Accordingly, the department's decision is **REVERSED**, and it is ORDERED that:

1. The department shall process Claimant's October 22, 2012, MA/Retro-MA application, and shall award him all the benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
2. The department shall review Claimant's medical condition for improvement in November, 2014, unless his Social Security Administration disability status is approved by that time.
3. The department shall obtain updated medical evidence from Claimant's treating physicians, physical therapists, pain clinic notes, etc. regarding his continued treatment, progress and prognosis at review.

It is SO ORDERED.



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

Date Signed: November 12, 2013

Date Mailed: November 12, 2013

NOTICE OF AP PEAL: 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.

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).

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.

HEADER

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

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

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

VLA/las

cc:

