

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2014-29085
Issue No: 2009
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 1, 2014
Monroe 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, a telephone hearing was held on July 1, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and her [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist.

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) 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 December 1, 2013, Claimant filed a review application for Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance benefits alleging continued disability.
3. On January 23, 2014, the Medical Review Team denied Claimant's application stating that Claimant had medical improvement.
4. On February 6, 2014, the Department caseworker sent Claimant notice that his Medical Assistance case would be cancelled based upon medical improvement.

5. On February 18, 2014, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
6. On May 2, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team again denied Claimant's application.
7. Claimant is a [REDACTED]-year-old [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5 feet 5 ½ inches tall and weighs 220 pounds. Claimant is a [REDACTED]. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basis math skills.
8. Claimant last worked in [REDACTED]. Claimant has also worked as a [REDACTED], a [REDACTED].
9. Claimant was receiving medical assistance based upon approval by the Medical Review Team from November 2011.
10. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: throat cancer, in remission, reflex sympathetic dystrophy, fibromyalgia, Gastro esophageal reflux disease, osteoarthritis, migraines, seizures, a 1996 fracture the tibia and fibula, herniated disc at L4 – 5, protruding discs in the neck, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, balance problems and degenerative disc disease.

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 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 [REDACTED]

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 Claimant was admitted [REDACTED] with a recent diagnosis of squamous cell carcinoma of the epiglottis and was status post initiation of radiation and chemotherapy. She [REDACTED], page 443. On [REDACTED], the Claimant had a [REDACTED] – thoracic/lumbar, pages 29 – 31. An encounter dated [REDACTED], indicated that Claimant was status post seizure and head [REDACTED] scan of the head and [REDACTED]. She was started on [REDACTED] page 107. The Claimant was 65 inches tall and weighed 227 pounds with a BMI of 37.79. Her trachea was midline, page 109. The oral mucosa was pink and moist. Speech was normal. Sensory, motor bulk and motor tone were normal. Strength was 5/5 in all muscles. There was no tenderness to palpation, no pain, swelling or edema of the spine or surrounding tissue. She had normal movements of the spine. There was no generalized lymphadenopathy, page 111. Diagnoses included seizure, Gastro esophageal reflux disease and generalized osteoarthritis including multiple sites, page 113. The Claimant was approved for benefits in [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] as meet/equal is listed 13.0 2E. The Claimant underwent radiation and chemotherapy. Her most recent records did not indicate any evidence of recurrence or spread of her cancer. She had an epidural for back pain. In [REDACTED] she had been treated for seizure. She was obese with a BMI of 37.79. Her speech was normal. Sensory, motor bulk and motor tone were normal. Strength was 5/5 in all muscles. There was no tenderness to palpation and no pain in the spine or surrounding tissue. Claimant had normal movements of the spine. Diagnoses included seizure gastro esophageal reflux disease and generalized osteoarthritis including multiple sites. The Claimant has had medical improvement.

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 his 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 the 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 research assistant.

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). vocational profile of **closely approaching advanced age of** [REDACTED] **and unknown work history**, MA-P is denied using Vocational Rule **202.13** 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 benefits based upon medical improvement.

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 review application for Medical Assistance benefits. The Claimant should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with the 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: 7/8/14

Date Mailed: 7/10/14

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.

2014-29085/LYL

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

LYL/tb

cc:

