

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-006691  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 11, 2014  
County: OGEMAW

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Aaron McClintic**

**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 11, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and a witness, [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA) benefit program?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. Claimant applied for MA-P on February 15, 2014.
2. The Medical Review Team (MRT) denied the application on July 16, 2014.
3. Claimant filed a request for hearing July 17, 2014, regarding the MA denial.
4. A telephone hearing was held on September 11, 2014.
5. Claimant is 5' 6" tall and weighs 123 pounds.
6. Claimant is 46 years of age.

7. Claimant's impairments have been medically diagnosed as multiple sclerosis, asthma and allergies.
8. Claimant has the following symptoms: pain, fatigue, muscle cramps, memory problems, balance problems and speech problems.
9. Claimant completed high school and some college.
10. Claimant is able to read, write, and perform basic math skills.
11. Claimant is not working. Claimant last worked in April 2014 as an in-home care provider. Claimant previously worked as an office worker.
12. Claimant lives alone.
13. Claimant testified that she cannot perform some household chores.
14. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
  - a. Gabapentin
  - b. Ranitidine
  - c. Prednisone
  - d. Claritin
15. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
  - i. Sitting: 30 minutes
  - ii. Standing: 10 minutes
  - iii. Walking: 1 block
  - iv. Bend/stoop: difficulty
  - v. Lifting: 5-8 lbs.
  - vi. Grip/grasp: no limitations
16. Claimant testified to experiencing pain, at a high level of 6, on an everyday basis.
17. Claimant's treating neurologist examined Claimant on [REDACTED], and provided the following assessment: "IMPRESSION: This lady had another attack of her disease. Current Kurtke score is a 4. Score 4 on the pyramidal axis, 2 in the sensory, bowel and bladder axes, 0 on cerebellar, brainstem, and visual axes. I was able to demonstrate fatigability on multiple muscles. The more she works or tries to do any type of manual labor she gets weaker than a 4-year-old girl does. I have done this testing on 4-year-old girls as controls. This severely limits her ability to work. She is now beginning to get momentary aphasias and memory problems. This goes along with part of the disease. The fact that she is having accidents in the GU and GI systems means that most likely intimacy will

suffer and her depression and fear of not knowing if her memory is going to be okay, puts ultimately severe problems on her functioning.”

18. Claimant is eligible for Healthy Michigan Plan Medicaid from April 2014 going forward.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

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 was working during the months of February, March and April 2014 earning approximately [REDACTED] gross per month. This was less than the statutory amount for substantial gainful activity therefore, the Claimant is not disqualified at this step in the evaluation. It should be noted that Claimant was within [REDACTED] of the statutory amount for substantial gainful activity up until mid-April 2014.

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. Listing 11.09 was 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 CRF 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 an in home care provider and office worker. Working as an office worker, as described by Claimant at hearing, would be considered sedentary work. The Claimant's impairments would not prevent Claimant from doing past relevant work. Claimant's testimony regarding her physical limitations was not supported by substantial medical evidence. Claimant could also not adequately explain why she was unable to perform the in home care provider job full time during the months of February, March and April 2014.

### **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: **10/10/2014**

Date Mailed: **10/10/2014**

AM/jaf

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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

cc:

