

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-004379
Issue No.: 2009; 4009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 2, 2014
County: Clinton

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 September 2, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and his authorized hearings [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Hearing Facilitator. This case is herein consolidated with Register # 1 [REDACTED] by stipulation of the parties.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (the Department) properly deny Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 December 27, 2013, [REDACTED] filed an application for Medical Assistance, and retroactive Medical Assistance benefits alleging disability.
2. On January 13, 2014, Claimant submitted an online application for Food Assistance Program benefits and State Disability Assistance.
3. On March 18, 2014, the medical packet which included all medical records was submitted to the Medical Review Team.
4. On March 18, 2014, the Department sent a DHS 1605 notice of case action to the Claimant and to [REDACTED] informing Claimant that he was not eligible for state disability assistance because he is not aged, blind, disabled, under 21, pregnant, or parent/caretaker relative of dependent child.

5. On March 19, 2014, the Department sent a DHS 176 benefit notice to the Claimant and [REDACTED] informing Claimant that he was not eligible for Medicaid based upon disability because he was determined not disabled by the medical review team's determination.
6. On March 27, 2014, [REDACTED] submitted a Medical Assistance application and retroactive Medical Assistance application on behalf of Claimant requesting medical coverage for the month of [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
7. On April 17, 2014, the medical packet which included of the medical records was submitted to the Medical Review Team.
8. On May 19, 2014, the Medical Review Team approved Claimant's application for Medical Assistance and indicated that the Claimant was determined disabled with eligibility began date of December 2013 which will require review date of May 2015.
9. On May 19, 2014 the Department caseworker sent Claimant and [REDACTED] a DHS 1606 healthcare coverage determination notice informing Claimant that he was approved ongoing health coverage.
10. On June 4, 2014 [REDACTED] submit a request for a hearing to Claimant's behalf for the December 27, 2013 application to contest the denial of retroactive Medical Assistance for the month of November 2013.
11. On June 23, 2014 Claimant filed an online application for State Disability Assistance.
12. On June 24, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team again denied Claimant's application for retroactive Medical Assistance benefits.
13. On July 11, 2014 the Department caseworker sent Claimant notice that he was approved for State Disability Assistance as on July 16, 2014 ongoing.
14. On July 21, 2014 Claimant submitted a request for hearing because he believed that the State Disability Assistance benefits should be approved and retroactive to the first application of January 31, 2014.
15. Claimant did not file a timely hearing request within 90 days of the original March 18, 2014, State Disability Assistance benefits denial notice.

16. Claimant is a [REDACTED]-year-old [REDACTED] whose [REDACTED]. Claimant is 6 feet tall and weighs 185 pounds. Claimant is a [REDACTED]. Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
17. Claimant last worked [REDACTED].
18. Claimant alleges as disabling impairments: neuropathy, diabetes, anxiety, posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, lower extremity fracture, clotting disorder, heart disease, degenerative disc disease, heart attack in 2009, double bypass surgery, broken left hip and hearing loss.

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 State Disability Assistance program differs from the federal Medical Assistance regulations in that the durational requirement is 90 days. This means that the person's impairments must meet the SSI disability standards for 90 days in order for that person to be eligible for SDA benefits.

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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600, p. 4, provides in relevant part as follows:

The Claimant or authorized hearing representative has 90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing. The request must be received anywhere in DHS within the 90 days.

In the instant case, Claimant filed an application for state disability assistance January 13, 2014. The notice of case action was since the Claimant informing him that he was not eligible for state disability assistance because he did not meet the disability standards in determination made by DHS. Claimant would have had to file a request for a hearing on the denial of state disability assistance benefits by June 18, 2014. Instead of filing for a request for hearing Claimant simply filed a new application for state disability assistance benefits. Because Claimant's request for hearing on the March 18, 2014 denial state disability assistance benefits was not within ninety days of the disputed action taken by the Department, this request for hearing must be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance 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

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. If there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

In determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual's functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these include --

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

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c).

The Administrative Law Judge is responsible for making the determination or decision about whether the statutory definition of disability is met. The Administrative Law Judge reviews all medical findings and other evidence that support a medical source's statement of disability.... 20 CFR 416.927(e).

A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the Claimant perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the Claimant is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
2. Does the Claimant have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the Claimant is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
3. Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the Claimant'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. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the Claimant do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the Claimant is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).

5. Does the Claimant 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, the analysis ends and the Claimant is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

In the instant case, the medical review team has approved Claimant for medical assistance benefits to December 2013. Thus, this decision only addresses retroactive Medical Assistance benefits for the month of November 2013. At Step 1, Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not [REDACTED]. Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates that Claimant testified on the record that Claimant testified his mother supports him and he is single and has no children under 18. He receives \$ [REDACTED] per month from State Disability Assistance benefits and Food Assistance Program benefits as well as the Medical Assistance program. Claimant does have a [REDACTED] and drives one time per week to doctor's appointments which is about 6 miles away. Claimant cooks one time per day makes microwave foods and serial. Claimant grocery shops with no help needed. Claimant washes dishes and vacuums. Claimant watches television two hours per day and use the computer one hour per week. Claimant testified he can stand for 20 minutes of time it can sit for 20 minutes at a time. He can walk 100 yards. He's able to shower, dress, squat, tie shoes, bend at the waist but not touch his toes. His knees are fine. His hands and arms are fine but he does have numbness and tingling in his legs and feet. Heaviest weight he can carry is 15 pounds.

A [REDACTED] indicates that Claimant was diagnosed with hypoglycemia, a history of deep vein thrombosis, altered mental status, Factor V Leiden mutation, diabetes mellitus, chronic pain and transaminases. Patient had tachycardia on admission. His delirium resolved quite well with just close monitoring. He admitted for noncompliance with his medications because of the expense. He had no insurance and recently moved to the Lansing area. He denied any suicidal ideation. Because of noncompliance he also had sub therapeutic iron level. He was given [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for his DVT, page 274. A CT of the abdomen showed her lungs were clear. Liver, spleen and pancreas. Gallbladder was identified. Normally abnormality. The bowel loops were normal in course caliber. The visualized portions of the appendix appeared normal. Scans through the pelvis were unremarkable. No mass, information fluid. The renal ultrasound indicated that there was mild hydronephrosis. No solid mass. The urinary bladder appeared normal. The liberal month was at the upper limits of my 17 cm. There was no evidence of a space occupying mass lesion. There is mild increased echogenicity with a geographic distribution suggestive of mild fatty change. The gallbladder appeared normal and is without evidence of cholelithiasis, gallbladder

while thickening or pericholecystic fluid, page 277. Venous duplex examination of the left lower extremity was obtained. There is no evidence for venous thrombosis. Normal color flow and waveform signal throughout the left lower extremity. There is compressibility. No soft tissue abnormality. Claimant had a normal penis to flex examination of the left lower extremity, page 278 Claimant was given IV hydration, supportive care and content appropriate home medications and was discharged in stable condition, page 278. A [REDACTED] report indicated Claimant presented with acute encephalopathy.

At Step 2, Claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that Claimant suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment. Claimant has reports of pain in multiple areas of his body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the Claimant. There are insufficient laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file. The clinical impression is that Claimant is **stable**. There is no medical finding that Claimant has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, Claimant has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that Claimant has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that Claimant has a severely restrictive physical impairment. In [REDACTED], Claimant's impairments do not meet duration.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating Claimant suffers severe mental limitations. There is **no** mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Claimant from working at any job. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Claimant was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that Claimant suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Claimant must be denied benefits at this step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If Claimant had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If Claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon his ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that Claimant is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if Claimant had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that Claimant does not have residual functional capacity.

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).

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.

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

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).

Claimant has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Claimant's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should

be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Claimant has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The Claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Claimant from working at any job. Claimant was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Claimant was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. 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 Claimant's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that Claimant has no residual functional capacity. Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments.

The Federal Regulations at 20 CFR 404.1535 speak to the determination of whether Drug Addiction and Alcoholism (DAA) is material to a person's disability and when benefits will or will not be approved. The regulations require the disability analysis be completed prior to a determination of whether a person's drug and alcohol use is material. It is only when a person meets the disability criterion, as set forth in the regulations, that the issue of materiality becomes relevant. In such cases, the regulations require a sixth step to determine the materiality of DAA to a person's disability.

When the record contains evidence of DAA, a determination must be made whether or not the person would continue to be disabled if the individual stopped using drugs or alcohol. The trier of fact must determine what, if any, of the physical or mental limitations would remain if the person were to stop the use of the drugs or alcohol and whether any of these remaining limitations would be disabling.

Claimant's testimony and the information indicate that Claimant has a history of **tobacco, drug, and alcohol abuse**. Applicable herein is the Drug Abuse and Alcohol (DA&A) Legislation, Public Law 104-121, Section 105(b)(1), 110 STAT. 853, 42 USC 423(d)(2)(C), 1382(c)(a)(3)(J) Supplement Five 1999. The law indicates that individuals are not eligible and/or are not disabled where drug addiction or alcoholism is a contributing factor material to the determination of disability. After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant does not meet the statutory disability definition under the authority of the DA&A Legislation because his substance abuse is material to his alleged impairment and alleged disability.

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. BEM, Item 261, p. 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

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 determined that Claimant was not eligible to receive Medical Assistance and/or State Disability Assistance.

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 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.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.



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

Date Signed: 9/22/14

Date Mailed: 9/23/14

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

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:

