

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2013-12343  
Issue No: 2009;4031  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 14, 2013  
Ogemaw County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Y. Lain

**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 on March 14, 2013. Claimant personally appeared and testified. The department was represented at the hearing by Assistance Payment Worker, [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (the department) properly deny claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

**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 September 12, 2012, claimant filed an application for Medical Assistance, Retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging disability.
2. On October 19, 2012, the Medical Review Team denied claimant's application stating that claimant's impairments lacked duration.
3. On October 24, 2012, the department caseworker sent claimant notice that her application was denied.
4. On November 15, 2012, claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the department's negative action.
5. On January 14, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: the claimant was diagnosed with a fracture in her back. In November, 2012, her gait was normal. Motor and sensory functions were normal. Reflexes

were 2+ and symmetrical bilaterally. She had deep tenderness in the right paraspinal and lumbar sacral spine with no other neurological deficits elicited. MRI scan of the lumbar spine showed grade 1 spondylolisthesis L5-S1 with spondylosis. The doctor indicated that she will not be able to do heavy lifting. Because of her educational background and the type of work she did, the doctor opined that she was disabled for "her work". The claimant is not currently engaging in substantial gainful activity based on the information that is available in file. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light work. A finding about the capacity for prior work has not been made. However, this information is not material because all potentially applicable medical-vocational guidelines would direct a finding of not disabled given the claimant's age, education and residual functional capacity. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile (younger individual, limited education and history of semi-skilled work), MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule 202.18 as a guide. Retroactive MA-P was considered in this case and is also denied. SDA is denied per PEM 261 because the nature and severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days.

6. The hearing was held on March 14, 2013. At the hearing, claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
7. Additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team on March 15, 2013.
8. On May 21, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team again denied claimant's application stating in its analysis and recommendation: claimant was diagnosed with a fracture in her back. In November, 2012, her gait was normal. Motor and sensory functions were normal. Reflexes were 2+ and symmetrical bilaterally. She had deep tenderness in the right paraspinal and lumbar sacral spine with no other neurological deficits elicited. MRI scan of the lumbar spine showed grade 1 spondylolisthesis L5-S1 with spondylosis. The doctor indicated that she will not be able to do heavy lifting. She retains the capacity to perform light work. The claimant is not currently engaging in substantial gainful activity based on the information that is available in file. The claimant's impairments do not meet/equal the intent or severity of a Social Security listing. The medical evidence of record indicates that the claimant retains the capacity to perform a wide range of light work. A finding about the capacity for prior work has not been made. However, this information is not material because all potentially applicable medical-vocational guidelines would direct a finding of not disabled given the claimant's age, education and residual functional capacity. Therefore, based on the claimant's vocational profile, MA-P and retroactive MA-P are denied using Vocational Rule 202.17 as a guide. SDA is denied per BEM 261 because the nature and

severity of the claimant's impairments would not preclude work activity at the above stated level for 90 days.

9. Claimant is a 49-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'7" tall and weighs 145 pounds. Claimant attended the 11<sup>th</sup> grade and does not have a GED and was in special education for reading. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
10. Claimant last worked July 24, 2012 at a trucking company in human resources, cleaning trucks and lifting. Claimant has also worked as a truck driver for about 10 years.
11. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: lumbar fracture, severe pain in the hips and degenerative disc disease. Claimant alleges no disabling mental impairments.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance program. Under SSI, 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 set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

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

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are 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).

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

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
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 416.920(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? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(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. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
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? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since July 24, 2012. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates that the claimant testified on the record that she lives with her son in a house and is single with no children under 18 who live with her. Claimant has no income and does not receive Food Assistance Program benefits. Claimant does have a driver's license and does drive 1 time per week and drives to the doctor. Claimant testified that she does cook 2 times per week and cooks things like soup and salad. Claimant testified that she grocery shops one time per month and she needs help with walking and lifting and she does dishes, wiping the counter and laundry. Claimant testified that she watches television 8 hours per day and has no other hobbies. Claimant testified that she can stand for 15-20 minutes at a time, can sit for 30 minutes at a time and can walk 1 block. Claimant testified that she is able to shower and dress herself and can tie her shoes while sitting, but cannot squat, she can somewhat bend at the waist and she cannot touch her toes because of pain. Claimant testified that her hands/arms are fine and her legs/feet are weak on the left side. Claimant testified that the heaviest weight she can carry is 5-10 lbs. Claimant testified that she smokes a pack of cigarettes per day, her doctors have told her to quit and she is not in a smoking cessation program. Claimant testified that she does drink one six pack of beer per week and her doctors have not told her to quit.

The claimant was seen in the emergency room on September 9, 2012 due to thoracic back pain that radiated into her lumbar region (p 14). A neurosurgery consultation dated November 20, 2012 indicated that the claimant had been diagnosed with a fracture but the specialist refused to do surgery because she did not have any insurance. On examination, her gait was normal. Muscles of the limbs were nontender. Motor and sensory functions were normal. Reflexes were 2+ and symmetrical bilaterally. Deep tenderness right paraspinal and lumbar sacral spine with no other neurological deficits elicited. Straight leg raise was 90° bilaterally. MRI scan of the lumbar spine showed

grade 1 spondylolisthesis L5-S1 with spondylosis. The doctor opined that she was not likely to improve with surgical intervention. However, she will not be able to do heavy lifting. Because of her educational background and the type of work she did, the doctor opined that she was disabled for "her work" (records from DDS). A Physical Residual Functional Capacity Questionnaire indicates that claimant can stand and walk for less than 2 hours in an 8 hour work day and is able to sit for at least 6 hours in an 8 hour work day. Claimant would need to include periods of walking during an 8 hour work day. She can never carry 50 lbs or more; occasionally carry 20 lbs and can frequently carry 10 lbs or less (p 50- 51). A November, 2012 medical examination report indicates that claimant's blood pressure was 90/64; pulse 88; respirations 20; temperature 97.7° and weight 144 lbs. Cardiac S1 and S2 were normal with no murmur. Respiratory air entry was equal. No rhonchi or crepitations. The abdomen was soft and nontender with no organomegaly. The musculoskeletal area had normal gait and muscles of the limbs were non-tender. The skin was warm to touch and had no cyanosis or clubbing. Ears, nose and throat: hearing was normal. Parotid non-tender. No oral pathology seen. The eyes showed pupils equal bilaterally. Visual fields normal. Lymphatics: cervical and axillary none. In the neck area the trachea was mid line. Thyroid not palpable and there were no carotid bruits (p 48). Neurologically the claimant was conscious, alert and oriented. Higher functions and cranial nerves were normal. Motor and sensory normal. Reflexes 2+ and symmetrical bilaterally. Cerebellar signs negative. Romberg sign negative. Hoffman sign negative. There was a pimple on the chin. Deep tenderness right paraspinal, lumbar sacral spine with no other neurological deficits elicited. Straight leg raising test 90° bilaterally. MRI scan lumbar spine showed grade 1 spondylolisthesis L5-S1 with spondylosis (p 49).

At Step 2, claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of her body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the claimant. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file which support claimant's contention of disability. The clinical impression is that claimant is stable. There is no medical finding that claimant has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, claimant has restricted herself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon her reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Claimant alleges no disabling mental impairments.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate

increased mental demands associated with competitive work)... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that claimant has failed to meet her burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon her failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny her again at Step 4 based upon her ability to perform her past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that claimant is unable to perform work in which she has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, she would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the department to establish that claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if

walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment or that she is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of her. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and she should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Claimant has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that she has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent her from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 49), with a less than high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Medical Vocational Rule 202.18.

It should be noted that claimant continues to smoke despite the fact that her doctor has told her to quit. Claimant is not in compliance with her treatment program.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

The department's Program Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because the claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the



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.

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

LYL/las

cc:

