

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-51259
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 31, 2013
County: Ottawa-70

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Aaron McClintic

HEARING DECISION

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, upon the Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, an in person hearing was held on October 31, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's Medical Assistance and State Disability applications?

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant applied for MA-P on November 24, 2013 with a request for retroactive coverage back to October 2012.
2. The Medical Review Team denied the application on March 8, 2013.
3. Claimant filed a request for hearing on May 3, 2013, regarding the MA denial.
4. An in person hearing was held on October 31, 2013.
5. On August 2, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team denied the application because the medical evidence of record indicates that the Claimant retains the capacity to perform unskilled work.
6. Claimant is 6' 8" tall and weighs 200 pounds.
7. Claimant is 40 years of age.
8. Claimant's impairments have been medically diagnosed as depression, anxiety, and PTSD.

9. Claimant has the following symptoms: insomnia, paranoia, auditory hallucinations, memory and concentration problems.
10. Claimant completed a GED.
11. Claimant is able to read, write, and perform basic math skills.
12. Claimant is not working. Claimant last worked in September 2013 as a box packer.
13. Claimant is homeless.
14. Claimant testified that he can perform some household chores.
15. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
 - a. lamictal
 - b. haldol
 - c. trazodone
16. Following hearing, the record was extended to gather updated records. Claimant agreed to this and waved timeliness standards.
17. The State Hearing Review Team again denied Claimant's appeal on February 3, 2014, because the Claimant retains the capacity to perform unskilled work.
18. Claimant received an unfavorable decision from the Social Security Administration on February 3, 2014 that addresses the period of time in question.
19. In a psychological examination report dated May 1, 2012, Claimant was found to have a GAF score of 55 to 60. Under prognosis the examining psychologist stated: "The potential for the patient becoming gainfully employed in a simple, unskilled work situation on a sustained and competitive basis is fair, pending his compliance with psychiatric treatment. The patient appeared to have no difficulty understanding, remembering and following through with simple instructions, and there appears to be no restrictions to his ability to perform simple, repetitive, concrete tasks.
20. In September 2012 Claimant was found to have a GAF score of 61.
21. In February 2012 Claimant was found to have a GAF score of 52.
22. In February 2013 Claimant was found to have a GAF score of 40.

23. In a Disability Determination Explanation dated March 9, 2013 the evaluator stated the following under Personalized Decision Notice: "Your condition results in some limitations in your ability to perform work related activities. We have determined that your condition is not severe enough to keep you from working. We consider the medical and other information, your age and education in determining how your condition affects your ability to work. We do not have sufficient vocational information to determine whether you can perform any of your past relevant work. However, based on the evidence in the file, we have determined that you can adjust to other work."

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 Medical Assistance (MA-P) 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 administers the MA-P 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 uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the MA-P 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.

Federal regulations require that the Department use the same operative definition for "disabled" as used for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 CFR 435.540(a).

"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.

In determining whether an individual is disabled, 20 CFR 416.920 requires the trier of fact to follow a sequential evaluation process by which current work activity, the severity of the impairment(s), residual functional capacity, and vocational factors (i.e., age, education, and work experience) are assessed in that order. When a determination that an individual is, or is not, disabled can be made at any step in the sequential evaluation, evaluation under a subsequent step is not necessary.

First, the trier of fact must determine if the individual is working and if the work is substantial gainful activity. 20 CFR 416.920(b). In this case, the Claimant is not working. Therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified at this step in the evaluation.

The second step to be determined in considering whether the Claimant is considered disabled is the severity of the impairment. In order to qualify the impairment must be considered severe, which is defined as an impairment which significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Examples of these include:

1. Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, 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).

In this case, the Claimant's medical evidence of record supports a finding that Claimant has significant physical and mental limitations upon Claimant's ability to perform basic work activities such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling. Medical evidence has clearly established that the Claimant has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on the Claimant's work activities. See Social Security Rulings: 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

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. Listings 12.03 and 12.04 were 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 box packer. Working as a box packer, as described by Claimant at hearing, would be considered light work. The Claimant's impairments would not prevent him from doing past relevant work. Claimant failed to present substantial medical evidence that he has an ongoing psychological impairment that is significantly limiting. In addition, this Administrative Law Judge is also bound by a final decision by the social security administration and Claimant received an unfavorable decision dated February 3, 2014 that covers the period in question.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Claimant is NOT medically disabled for the purposes of MA- P eligibility.

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



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

Date Signed: February 28, 2014

Date Mailed: February 28, 2014

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 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

AM/las

cc:

