

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2013-65601  
Issue No: 2009; 4009  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 16, 2014  
Kent County DHS

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

**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 January 16, 2014, from Grand Rapids, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included and her [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Family Independence Manager.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (the Department) properly determine that Claimant was no longer disabled and deny his review application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) based upon medical improvement?

**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 was a Medical Assistance benefit recipient and the Medical Assistance case was scheduled for review in November 2012.
2. On November 10, 2012, Claimant filed a review application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging continued disability.
3. On August 12, 2013, the Medical Review Team denied Claimant's application stating that Claimant had medical improvement and could perform other work.
4. On August 14, 2013, the Department caseworker sent Claimant notice that the Medical Assistance case would be cancelled based upon medical improvement.

5. On August 19, 2013, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
6. On October 22, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team again denied Claimant's application.
7. On January 16, 2014, the hearing was held. Claimant waived the time periods and requested to submit additional medical information.
8. On March 6, 2014, additional medical information was submitted and sent to the State Hearing Review Team for further review.
9. On May 7, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team again denied Claimant's application stating that Claimant could perform light exertional, simple and repetitive tasks pursuant to vocational rule 202.17.
10. Claimant is a [REDACTED]-year-old [REDACTED] whose [REDACTED] Claimant is 5'4" tall and weighs 220 pounds. Claimant attended the [REDACTED] and has no GED. Claimant is able to read, write and does have basis math skills.
11. Claimant last worked about [REDACTED] before the hearing as a [REDACTED]. She has also worked for [REDACTED].
12. Claimant was receiving Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance based upon approval by the Medical Review Team from May 1, 2012.
13. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: anxiety, depression, neck problems, yeast infection, hypertension, fibromyalgia, degenerative disc disease, migraines, neck surgery July 8, 2013/discectomy, hyperventilation, and panic attack.

### **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). Claimants 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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) 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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

In general, Claimant has the responsibility to prove that he/she is disabled. Claimant's impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only Claimant's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the Claimant has an impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

Once an individual has been determined to be "disabled" for purposes of disability benefits, continued entitlement to benefits must be periodically reviewed. In evaluating whether an individual's disability continues, 20 CFR 416.994 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activities, severity of impairment(s), and the possibility of medical improvement and its relationship to the individual's ability to work are assessed. Review may cease and benefits may be continued at any point if there is substantial evidence to find that the individual is unable to engage in substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5).

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(i). In this case, the Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since approximately **2005**.

Secondly, if the individual has an impairment or combination of impairments which meet or equal the severity of an impairment listed in Appendix 1 to Subpart P of Part 404 of Chapter 20, disability is found to continue. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii).

The objective medical evidence in the record indicates that the [REDACTED] showed the Claimant denied inpatient mental health treatment. There was fear attention to dress and hygiene. She had adequate spontaneity, organization and logic. She was quite talkative. There were no hallucinations or delusions. There were strong depression, anxiety and panic reactions. Diagnoses included major depression with anxiety and panic features, depression secondary to medical disorder, somatoform disorder and dependent personality pattern. On [REDACTED] the Claimant was 237 pounds. Her blood pressure was 150/94. Range of motion of the cervical spine caused neck pain. She had pain with palpation of the cervical paraspinal muscles, upper trapezius muscles, occipital areas, temporalis muscles and frontalis muscles bilaterally. Strength was 5/5 in the upper extremities bilaterally. Reflexes were 3+ in the upper and lower extremities bilaterally. Pinprick

sensation was normal. Affect was normal. Impression was cervical dystonia, chronic migraine headaches, cervical radiculitis, anxiety and depression. In October 17, 2013, MRI of the cervical spine shows prior anterior fusion C6 – seven with multilevel degenerative disc disease.

The Claimant was denied disability benefits by the Social Security Administration on [REDACTED]. Therefore, benefits would be denied based on the final and binding Social Security decision. Medical improvement would not be considered in the current claim is evaluated as a new initial application. The Claimant denied inpatient health treatments. She had adequate spontaneity, organization and logic. There was evidence of psychosis. There were strong depression, anxiety and panic reactions. The medical evidence of record indicates that the Claimant retains the capacity to perform light exertional, simple and repetitive tasks pursuant to medical vocational rule 202.17.

At Step 2, Claimant's impairments do not equal or meet the severity of an impairment listed in Appendix 1.

In the third step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact must determine whether there has been medical improvement as defined in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i). 20 CFR 416.994 (b)(5)(iii). Medical improvement is defined as any decrease in the medical severity of the impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision that the Claimant was disabled or continues to be disabled. A determination that there has been a decrease in medical severity must be based on changes (improvement) in the symptoms, signs, and/or laboratory findings associated with Claimant's impairment(s). If there has been medical improvement as shown by a decrease in medical severity, the trier of fact must proceed to Step 4 (which examines whether the medical improvement is related to the Claimant's ability to do work). If there has been no decrease in medical severity and thus no medical improvement, the trier of fact moves to Step 5 in the sequential evaluation process.

In the instant case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant does have medical improvement and her medical improvement is related to the Claimant's ability to perform substantial gainful activity.

If there is a finding of medical improvement related to Claimant's ability to perform work, the trier of fact is to move to Step 6 in the sequential evaluation process.

In the sixth step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to determine whether the Claimant's current impairment(s) is severe per 20 CFR 416.921. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vi). If the residual functional capacity assessment reveals significant limitations upon a Claimant's ability to engage in basic work activities, the trier of fact moves to Step 7 in the sequential evaluation process. In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds Claimant can perform at least sedentary work even with his impairments. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant can perform light work even with her impairments.

In the seventh step of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to assess a Claimant's current ability to engage in substantial gainful activities in accordance with 20 CFR 416.960 through 416.969. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vii). The trier of fact is to assess the Claimant's current residual functional capacity based on all current impairments and consider whether the Claimant can still do work he/she has done in the past. In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant could probably perform past work as a cashier or sorter at UPS.

In the final step, Step 8, of the sequential evaluation, the trier of fact is to consider whether the Claimant can do any other work, given the Claimant's residual function capacity and Claimant's age, education, and past work experience. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(viii). In this case, based upon the Claimant's vocational profile of **younger individual at age [REDACTED] a less than [REDACTED] history of gainful employment**, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule **202.17** as a guide. Claimant can perform other work in the form of light work per 20 CFR 416.967(b). This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant does have medical improvement in this case and the Department has established by the necessary, competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with Department policy when it proposed to cancel Claimant's Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits based upon medical improvement.

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. PEM, Item 261, page 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 does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits either.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department has appropriately established on the record that it was acting in compliance with Department policy when it denied Claimant's continued disability and application for Medical Assistance, retroactive Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits. The Claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The Department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence. Claimant does have medical improvement based upon the objective medical findings in the file.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.



---

Landis Y. Lain  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 5/27/14

Date Mailed: 5/28/14

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 Claimant;
- 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

2013-65601/LYL

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

LYL/tb

cc:

