

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
██████████  
██████████

Reg. No.: 2013-33619  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: July 23, 2013  
County: Cass-00

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Aaron McClintic

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge, pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL, 400.37 following Claimant's Request for Hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on July 23, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf Claimant included the Claimant. Participant on behalf of the Department included, Laveda Brookins, AP Supervisor, and, Jessica Lopez.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant had medical improvement and was not disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant applied and was approved for MA-P benefits in 2009.
2. The Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant disabled for purposes of the MA-P benefit program.
3. In December 2012, the Department reviewed the Claimant's eligibility.
4. On February 27, 2013, the MRT found the Claimant no longer disabled.
5. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
6. On March 1, 2012, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing.

7. The Claimant has physical disabling impairments including, ulcerative colitis.
8. Claimant has had medical improvement in his condition.
9. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
  - a. Apriso
  - b. Predisone
  - c. Amitryptiline
  - d. Tramadol
  - e. Remicade
10. Claimant testified to experiencing pain, at a high level of 8, on an everyday basis with some pain, always present, at a low level of 2-3.
11. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
  - i. Sitting: all day
  - ii. Standing: 10 minutes
  - iii. Walking: 1/2 mile
  - iv. Bend/stoop: no difficulty
  - v. Lifting: 20-30 lbs.
  - vi. Grip/grasp: no limitations
12. Claimant testified that he has an average of 6-10 bowel movements in an 8 hour day, and that he is in the bathroom, on average, 10 minutes.
13. Claimant is 31 years old.
14. Claimant gained 125 pounds since he was found disabled. Claimant's weight has been stable the last year.

### **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 of Human Services ("DHS"), 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 Manual ("BRM").

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).

Once an individual has been found disabled for purposes of MA benefits, continued entitlement is periodically reviewed in order to make a current determination or decision as to whether disability remains in accordance with the medical improvement review standard...20 CFR 416.993(a); 20 CFR 416.994. In evaluating a claim for ongoing MA benefits, federal regulations require a sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5) The review may cease and benefits continued if sufficient evidence supports a finding that an individual is still unable to engage in substantial gainful activity. *Id.* Prior to deciding an individual's disability has ended, the Department will develop, along with the Claimant's cooperation, a complete medical history covering at least the 12 months preceding the date the individual signed a request seeking continuing disability benefits. 20 CFR 416.993(b). The Department may order a consultative examination to determine whether or not the disability continues. 20 CFR 416.993(c)

The first step in the analysis in determining whether an individual's disability has ended requires the trier of fact to consider the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1 of subpart P of part 404 of Chapter 20...20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(i) If a Listing is met, an individual's disability is found to continue with no further analysis required.

If the impairment(s) does not meet or equal a Listing, then Step 2 requires a determination of whether there has been medical improvement as defined in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii) Medical improvement is defined as any decrease in the medical severity of the impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most favorable medical decision that the individual was disabled or continues to be disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i) If no medical improvement found, and no exception

applies (see listed exceptions below), then an individual's disability is found to continue. Conversely, if medical improvement is found, Step 3 calls for a determination of whether there has been an increase in the residual functional capacity ("RFC") based on the impairment(s) that were present at the time of the most favorable medical determination. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iii)

If medical improvement is not related to the ability to work, Step 4 evaluates whether any listed exception applies. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iv) If no exception is applicable, disability is found to continue. *Id.* If the medical improvement *is* related to an individual's ability to do work, then a determination of whether an individual's impairment(s) are severe is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iii), (v) If severe, an assessment of an individual's residual functional capacity to perform past work is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vi) If an individual can perform past relevant work, disability does not continue. *Id.* Similarly, when evidence establishes that the impairment(s) do (does) not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental abilities to do basic work activities, continuing disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(v) Finally, if an individual is unable to perform past relevant work, vocational factors such as the individual's age, education, and past work experience are considered in determining whether despite the limitations an individual is able to perform other work. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vii) Disability ends if an individual is able to perform other work. *Id.*

The first group of exceptions (as mentioned above) to medical improvement (i.e., when disability can be found to have ended even though medical improvement has not occurred) found in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(3) are as follows:

- (i) Substantial evidence shows that the individual is the beneficiary of advances in medical, or vocational, therapy or technology (related to the ability to work);
- (ii) Substantial evidence shows that the individual has undergone vocational therapy related to the ability to work;
- (iii) Substantial evidence shows that, based on new or improved diagnostic or evaluative techniques, the impairment(s) is not as disabling as previously determined at the time of the most recent favorable decision;
- (iv) Substantial evidence demonstrates that any prior disability decision was in error.

The second group of exceptions [20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)] to medical improvement are as follows:

- (i) A prior determination was fraudulently obtained;
- (ii) The individual failed to cooperate;
- (iii) The individual cannot be located;
- (iv) The prescribed treatment that was expected to restore the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity was not followed.

If an exception from the second group listed above is applicable, a determination that the individual's disability has ended is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iv) The second group of exceptions to medical improvement may be considered at any point in the process. *Id.*

As discussed above, the first step in the sequential evaluation process to determine whether the Claimant's disability continues, looks at the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets, or equals, a listed impairment in Appendix 1.

At the time of the Claimant's initial approval, the Claimant had a diagnosis of testicular cancer. At the hearing, Claimant's testicular cancer was in remission.

### **“Listing”**

In this case, the Claimant's testicular cancer is in remission. Claimant's impairments do not meet, or equal, a listing. In light of the foregoing, a determination of whether the Claimant's condition has medically improved is necessary.

As noted above, the Claimant was previously found disabled in August 2011. In comparing those medical records to the recent evidence (as detailed above), it is found that the Claimant's condition has medically improved. Accordingly, the Claimant's disability must be further evaluated under the sequential analysis. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii)

In the third step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment (or combination of impairments) is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant's medical record does not support a finding that the Claimant's impairment(s) is a “listed impairment” or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR Part 404, Part A. Listing 5.08 was considered.

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: clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for a recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities, or ability to reason and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged. 20 CFR 416.913. A conclusory statement by a physician, or mental health professional, that an individual is disabled, or blind, is not sufficient, without supporting medical evidence to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

The fourth step of the analysis to be considered is whether the Claimant has the ability to perform work previously performed by the Claimant within the past 15 years. The trier of fact must determine whether the impairment(s) presented prevent the Claimant from doing past relevant work. In the present case, the Claimant's past employment was as a fork lift operator. Working as a fork lift operator would be considered medium

work. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant is not capable of medium exertional work. This Administrative Law Judge will continue through step 5.

In the final step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine if the Claimant's impairment(s) prevent the Claimant from doing other work. 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the Claimant's:

1. residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations? 20 CFR 416.945;
2. age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-965; and
3. the kinds of work which exist, in significant numbers, in the national economy, which the Claimant could perform despite his/her limitations. 20 CFR 416.966.

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).

**Medium work:** Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting, or carrying, of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

**Heavy work:** Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting, or carrying, of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do

heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once the Claimant makes it to the final step of the analysis, the Claimant has already established a prima facie case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 732 Fd2 962 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1984). Moving forward the burden of proof rests with the state to prove by substantial evidence that the Claimant has the residual function capacity for substantial gainful activity.

After careful review of Claimant's extensive medical record, and the Administrative Law Judge's interaction with Claimant at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant would be able to perform work at least on the sedentary exertional level.

The Claimant is a younger individual at age 33. 20 CFR 416.963. Claimant's previous work has been unskilled. Federal Rule 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, contains specific profiles for determining disability based on residual functional capacity and vocational profiles. Under Table 1, Rule 202.20, the Claimant is not disabled for the purposes of MA-P.

The Department has met its burden proving that Claimant has had medical improvement that would warrant a finding that he is no longer disabled. Claimant testified that his condition had improved and that he was capable of sitting "all day".

In this case, the Claimant is found not disabled for purposes of continued Medical Assistance entitlements.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The Department's determination is **AFFIRMED** and Claimant's MA-P benefits shall be processed for closure if not done so already.



---

**Aaron McClintic**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 08/09/2013

Date Mailed: 08/09/2013

**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; or
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that affect the substantial rights of the Claimant; or
  - 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

AM/pw

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