

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-68084  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 24, 2014  
County: Calhoun

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

**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 April 24, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and her authorized hearings representative [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]. During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision in order to allow for the submission of additional medical evidence.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department of Human Services (Department) properly determine that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) based on disability?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. On May 23, 2013, the Claimant submitted an application for Medical Assistance (MA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On July 8, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) because it determined that her impairment does not meet the durational requirement.
3. On July 15, 2013, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.
4. On September 5, 2013, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.

5. On October 24, 2013, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) upheld the Medical Review Team's (MRT) denial of Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefits.
6. On August 10, 2014, after reviewing the additional medical records, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) again upheld the determination of the Medical Review Team (MRT) that the Claimant does not meet the disability standard.
7. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).
8. The Social Security Administration (SSA) denied the Claimant's federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) application and the Claimant reported that a SSI appeal is pending.
9. The Claimant is a 51-year-old woman whose birth date is [REDACTED].
10. Claimant is 5' 2" tall and weighs 187 pounds.
11. The Claimant is a high school graduate.
12. The Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
13. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
14. The Claimant has past relevant work experience providing childcare where she was required to prepare meals, groom children, supervise children, and lift children weighing up to 25 pounds.
15. The Claimant's disability claim is based on arthritis, back pain, hypertension, high cholesterol, tachycardia, diabetes, neuropathy, fibromyalgia, and rheumatoid arthritis.

### **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, Rule 400.901 - 400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because her claim for assistance has been denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903. 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. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-44.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.

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 Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...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.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order.

### **STEP 1**

Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is not disabled.

At step 1, a determination is made on whether the Claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that she has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, she is not disabled regardless of how severe her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

The Claimant testified that she has not been employed since 2005 and is not currently engaged in substantial gainful activity, which was not disputed by the Department during the hearing. Therefore this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

### **STEP 2**

Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is not disabled.

At step two, a determination is made whether the Claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921). If the Claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, she is not disabled. If the Claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The Claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that she has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months, or result in death.

The Claimant is a 51-year-old woman that is 5' 2" tall and weighs 187 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to arthritis, back pain, hypertension, high cholesterol, tachycardia, diabetes, neuropathy, fibromyalgia, and rheumatoid arthritis.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

The Claimant was treated in a hospital emergency room for a cough and chest tightness on [REDACTED]. Treating physicians diagnosed the Claimant with an upper respiratory infection and chest pain.

The Claimant received inpatient treatment for diabetes from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] through [REDACTED].

The Claimant underwent a sleep study on [REDACTED]. Treating physicians diagnosed the Claimant with severe obstructive sleep apnea, but no significant cardiac arrhythmias were noted.

On [REDACTED], blood tests revealed that the Claimant had a glycated hemoglobin (A1C) level of 12.50%.

On [REDACTED], a consultative physician found the Claimant to have a reduced range of motion of her dorsolumbar spine and shoulders, but was normal throughout the remainder of her body. A straight leg test was negative. The Claimant has decreased hand strength but maintains full dexterity. The Claimant is capable of a normal gait without assistance. The consultative physician diagnosed the Claimant with dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, asthma, and fibromyalgia.

The evidence on the record indicates that the Claimant has been diagnosed with arthritis, fibromyalgia, diabetes, dyslipidemia, and hypertension by treating physicians. The Claimant's diabetes and fibromyalgia cause her to suffer from chronic pain. The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to the Claimant's ability to

perform work. The Claimant is capable of a normal gait, and while she had reduced strength, her dexterity is not impaired.

The objective medical evidence of record is not sufficient to establish that Claimant has severe impairments that have lasted or are expected to last 12 months or more and prevent employment at any job for 12 months or more. Therefore, Claimant is found not to be disabled at this step. In order to conduct a thorough evaluation of Claimant's disability assertion, the analysis will continue.

### **STEP 3**

Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4.

At step three, a determination is made whether the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the Claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for high cholesterol under section 4.00 Cardiovascular system because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from severe atherosclerosis or other coronary artery disease.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for tachycardia under section 4.05 Recurrent arrhythmias because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate uncontrolled, recurrent episodes of cardiac syncope despite prescribed treatment.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing under section 1.04 Disorders of the spine, because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant suffers from nerve root compression resulting in loss of motor strength or reflexes, or resulting in a positive straight leg test. The objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant has been diagnosed with spinal arachnoiditis. The objective medical evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant's impairment has resulted in an inability to ambulate effectively. The Claimant was found by a physician to be capable of a normal gait without assistance and a straight leg test was negative. The Claimant's testimony that suggests she is not capable of less than sedentary work is not supported by objective medical evidence.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing under section 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant's impairment involves a weight bearing joint resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, or impairment in each upper extremity resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively. Inability to perform fine and gross

movements effectively includes the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level. The Claimant was found by a physician to be capable of a normal gait without assistance. The Claimant has some loss of strength in her hands but a physician that she maintains full dexterity. The Claimant's testimony that suggests she is not capable of less than sedentary work is not supported by objective medical evidence.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for arthritis under section 14.09 Inflammatory Arthritis, because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate an impairment involving a weight-bearing joint and resulting in an inability to ambulate effectively. The objective evidence does not support a finding that the Claimant lacks the ability to perform fine and gross movements with each upper extremity. Inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively includes the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level. No objective evidence was presented on the record that supports a finding that the Claimant lacks the ability to perform fine and gross movements with her upper extremities, while there is objective evidence that indicates the Claimant's dexterity is unimpaired.

The effects of diabetes are most readily observed through it impairments of other body systems. The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for diabetes under Section 9.00 Endocrine because the objective medical evidence does not support a finding of another severe impairment in another body system cause by diabetes. The Claimant's diabetes will be further considered when evaluating his residual functional capacity.

The effects of hypertension are most readily observed through it impairments of other body systems. The Claimant's impairment does not meet a listing for hypertension. The objective medical evidence indicates that medical evidence does not support a finding of a severe impairment of a body system secondary his severe hypertension. The Claimant's hypertension will be further considered when evaluating his residual functional capacity.

The medical evidence of the Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that she would meet a statutory listing in federal code of regulations 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.

#### **STEP 4**

Can the client do the former work that she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is not disabled.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, a determination is made of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(c)). An individual's residual functional capacity is her ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from her impairments. In making this finding, the undersigned must consider all of the Claimant's impairments,

including impairments that are not severe (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, a determination is made on whether the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of her past relevant work (20 CFR 404.1520(f) and 416.920(f)). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. In addition, the work must have lasted long enough for the Claimant to learn to do the job and have been SGA (20 CFR 404.1560(b), 404.1565, 416.960(b), and 416.965). If the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do her past relevant work, the Claimant is not disabled. If the Claimant is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth and last step.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium, and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls.... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

To determine the skills required in the national economy of work you are able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled. These terms have the same meaning as defined in. 20 CFR 416.968.

Unskilled work. Unskilled work is work which needs little or no judgment to do simple duties that can be learned on the job in a short period of time. The job may or may not require considerable strength. For example, we consider jobs unskilled if the primary work duties are handling, feeding and offbearing (that is, placing or removing materials from machines which are automatic or operated by others), or machine tending, and a person can usually learn to do the job in 30 days, and little specific vocational preparation and judgment are needed. A person does not gain work skills by doing unskilled jobs. 20 CFR 416.968(a).

The Claimant is capable of a normal gait without assistance. The Claimant suffers from reduced strength in her hands but retains full dexterity. The Claimant suffers from chronic pain that could reasonably be expected to arise from the medical conditions she has been diagnosed with. The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to the Claimant's ability to perform work. After careful consideration of the entire record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567 and 416.967.

The Claimant has past relevant work experience providing child care where she was required to lift children weighing as much as 25 pounds. The Claimant's prior work fits the definition of medium work.

There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that the Claimant is able to perform work substantially similar to work performed in the past.

### **STEP 5**

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that the Claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) for Substantial Gainful Activity.

Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, client is not disabled.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), a determination is made whether the Claimant is able to do any other work considering her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the Claimant is able to do other work, she is not disabled. If the Claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirement, she is disabled.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

The objective medical evidence indicates that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment and that she is physically able to do less strenuous tasks if demanded of her. The Claimant's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light work.

The Claimant's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to the Claimant's ability to perform light work.

Medical vocational guidelines have been developed and can be found in 20 CFR, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 200.00. When the facts coincide with a particular guideline, the guideline directs a conclusion as to disability. 20 CFR 416.969.

Claimant is 51-years-old, a person closely approaching advanced age, 50-54, with a high school education, and a history of unskilled work. Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work. Medical Assistance (M.A.) is denied using Vocational Rule 202.13 as a guideline.

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. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 261 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-8. 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 the 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.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds Claimant not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (M.A.) benefits.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

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



---

Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 28, 2014

Date Mailed: August 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

KS/las

cc:

