

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg No.: 2013-56222  
Issue No.: 2009, 4031  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 8, 2013  
DHS MA SPECTRUM PILOT

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt**

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was conducted from Lansing, Michigan on August 8, 2013. The Claimant appeared and testified. Participating on behalf of the Department of Human Services ("Department") was [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance ("MA-P") 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. On March 7, 2013 the Claimant submitted an application for public assistance seeking MA-P and SDA benefits.
2. On April 2, 2013, the Medical Review Team ("MRT") found the Claimant not disabled. (Exhibit A, pp. 10, 11)
3. On April 3, 2013, the Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination. (Exhibit A, pp. 5-7)
4. On June 27, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing. (Exhibit A, p. 3)
5. On July 10, 2013, the MRT found the Claimant not disabled a second time. (Exhibit A, pp. 8, 9)

6. The Claimant alleged physical disabling impairments due to spina-bifida with meningocele. (Exhibit A, pp. 14, 16)
7. At the time of hearing, the Claimant was 27 years old with a [REDACTED] birth date; was 5'7" in height; and weighed 150 pounds.
8. The Claimant has a high school education and employment experience as a receiving clerk (Meijers).

### **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").

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 416.913. 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).

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1). The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with

vocational factors (i.e. age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945.

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4) If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from step three to step four. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 416.945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both steps four and five. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a). An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, the Claimant is not involved in substantial gainful activity and, therefore, is not ineligible for disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the Claimant's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 416.921(b). Examples 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.

The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit.<sup>1</sup> The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint.<sup>2</sup> An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work.<sup>3</sup>

In the present case, the Claimant alleges disability due to spina-bifida with meningocele.

On January 19, 2013, the Claimant was seen in the [REDACTED] emergency room for a head/neck injury due to a fall. A CT scan of the Claimant's head was taken and revealed no acute intracranial abnormalities with mild right supraorbital soft tissue swelling and no evidence of an acute injury to the cervical spine. After several hours of observation, the Claimant presented with no significant pain, no midline cervical tenderness and demonstrated full active range of motion. (Exhibit A, pp. 24-30)

On July 11, 2013, the Claimant underwent a consultative exam. Upon examination, the Claimant was found to have a wide based gait and able to ambulate independently with full range of motion, unimpaired dexterity with normal reflexes. (Exhibit A, pp. 32, 33)

During the hearing, the Claimant testified he was able to work but was appealing the MRT's non-disabled finding because he was being required to by [REDACTED] in order to qualify for financial assistance for outstanding bills.

As previously noted, the Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In the present case, Claimant testified that he suffered from spina-bifida with meningocele but was able to work. While the medical evidence showed the Claimant had suffered at one time (birth) from spina-bifida, the records indicate the Claimant is still able to fully function.

Therefore, based on the lack of objective medical evidence that the alleged impairment(s) are severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disability, Claimant is denied at step 2 for lack of a severe impairment and no further analysis is required.

With regard to Claimant's request for disability under the State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, it should be noted that the Department's Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) contains policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the SDA program. In order to receive SDA, "a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older." BEM, Item 261, p. 1. Because Claimant does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA-P program and because the evidence of record

---

<sup>1</sup> *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 863 citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985).

<sup>3</sup> *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985).

does not show that Claimant is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 (ninety) days, Claimant is also not disabled for purposes of the SDA program. The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it acted in compliance with Department policy when it determined that Claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance or State Disability Assistance.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds the Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.



**Corey A. Arendt**  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 20, 2013

Date Mailed: August 20, 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

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

CAA/las

cc:

