

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.:
Issue No.:
Case No.:
Hearing Date:
County:

[REDACTED]

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 March 20, 2014, from Monroe, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included the Claimant and witness [REDACTED] Claimant's Authorized Representative [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] also appeared. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's Medical Assistance application?

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant applied for MA-P on February 11, 2013 with a request for retroactive coverage back to December 2012.
2. The Medical Review Team denied the application on July 1, 2013.
3. Claimant filed a request for hearing on September 30, 2013, regarding the MA denial.
4. A telephone hearing was held on March 20, 2014.
5. On November 20, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team denied the application because the medical evidence of record does not document a mental/ physical impairment that significantly limits the Claimant's ability to perform basic work activities.

6. Claimant is 6' 0" tall and weighs 200 pounds.
7. Claimant is 46 years of age.
8. Claimant's impairments have been medically diagnosed as ulcerative colitis, depression, bipolar disorder and back pain.
9. Claimant has the following symptoms: pain, fatigue, stomach cramps, rectal bleeding, insomnia, memory and concentration problems and vision problems.
10. Claimant completed high school.
11. Claimant is able to read, write, and perform basic math skills.
12. Claimant is not working. Claimant last worked in 2012 as a [REDACTED]
13. Claimant lives with his brother.
14. Claimant testified that he cannot perform some household chores.
15. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
 - a. Neurontin
 - b. Depakote
 - c. Celexa
 - d. Vicodin
 - e. Naprosen
16. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
 - i. Sitting: 10 minutes
 - ii. Standing: 10 minutes
 - iii. Walking: 30-40 yards
 - iv. Bend/stoop: some difficulty
 - v. Lifting: 20 lbs.
 - vi. Grip/grasp: no limitations
17. A CT of Claimant's lumbar spine showed the following: "L2-L3 level demonstrates disc space narrowing and circumferential disc bulge and endplate osteophyte. There is very minimal central canal narrowing. At L3-L4, there is extensive facet hypertrophy especially in the left. There is circumferential disc bulge. There is moderate canal narrowing. There is bilateral neuroforaminal encroachment worse on the left where there does appear to be mass effect in the nerve root. At L4-L5, there is facet hypertrophy. There is mild disc space narrowing. There is circumferential disc bulge and endplate osteophyte. There is mild central canal narrowing. There is bilateral neuroforaminal encroachment

worse on the left where there does appear to be mass effect on the nerve root. At L5-S1, there is mild disc space narrowing. There is minimal facet hypertrophy. There is mild generalized disc bulge. There is no central canal narrowing. There is bilateral neural foraminal narrowing worse on the left where there does appear to be very minimal mass effect on the exiting nerve root.”

18. Claimant treating physician completed a medical examination report dated October 9, 2013, that states Claimant is capable of lifting “less than 10 pounds” occasionally. Under Standing/Walking and Sitting, Claimant’s treating physician noted “none”.
19. Claimant testified to experiencing pain at a high level of 10 on an everyday basis with some pain always present at a low level of 5-6.
20. Claimant uses a cane to ambulate.

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 this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant may be considered presently disabled at the third step. Claimant meets listing 1.04 or its equivalent. The testimony of Claimant's treating therapist supports this position. This Administrative Law Judge will not continue through the remaining steps of the assessment. Claimant's testimony and the medical documentation support the finding that Claimant meets the requirements of the listing. Claimant has other significant health problems that were not fully addressed in this decision because Claimant is found to meet a listing for a different impairment.

Therefore, Claimant is found to be disabled.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Claimant is medically disabled as of December 2012.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby **REVERSED** and the Department is ORDERED to:

1. Initiate a review of the application for MA and Retro MA dated February 11, 2013, if not done previously, to determine Claimant's non-medical eligibility.
2. The Department shall inform Claimant of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for April 2015.



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

Date Signed: April 11, 2014

Date Mailed: April 11, 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

ATM/nr

cc:

