

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 14-007877
Issue No.: 4009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 25, 2014
County: KALAMAZOO

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 25, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. 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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 was awarded Medical Assistance (MA) program benefits based on a 2010 application.
2. In January 2014, the Department reviewed the Claimant's SDA eligibility.
3. On July 30, 2014, the Medical Review Team (MRT) found the Claimant no longer disabled.
4. The Department notified the Claimant of the MRT determination.
5. On July 21, 2014, the Department received the Claimant's timely written request for hearing.
6. The Claimant has physically disabling impairments including shoulder injury, depression, and hypertension.

7. Claimant has the following symptoms: pain, fatigue, insomnia, memory and concentration problems, and panic attacks.
8. The Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of 12 months or longer.
9. Claimant has had no medical improvement in his condition.
10. Claimant credibly testified that his physical health has not improved significantly since he was found to be disabled.
11. Claimant takes the following prescribed medications:
 - a. Tramadol
 - b. Norco
 - c. Zyrtec
 - d. Norvasc
 - e. Lisinopril
 - f. HCTZ
 - g. Spironolactone
12. Claimant testified to the following physical limitations:
 - I. Sitting: 25-30 minutes
 - II. Standing: 25-30 minutes
 - III. Walking: 10 yards
 - IV. Bend/stoop: difficulty
 - V. Lifting: 10 lbs.
 - VI. Grip/grasp: no limitations
13. Claimant testified to experiencing pain, at a high level of 6-7, on an everyday basis with some pain, always present, at a low level of 4.
14. Claimant was not working at the time of hearing. Claimant last worked in 2009 as a janitor.
15. Claimant has a chore provider who helps him dress and with housekeeping.
16. In a consultative psychological examination the consulting psychologist stated the following under summary and conclusions: "Based on these findings, my DSM 5 impression is the following: Persistent Depressive Disorder, moderate." Under Prognosis the following was stated: "The overall prognosis appears to be guarded. The combination of health and mental health issues appear to contribute to that prognosis."

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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

Receipt of SSI or RSDI benefits based on disability, or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability, or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

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). 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 his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities, or ability to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is alleged. 20 CFR 413.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a). Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician, or mental health professional, that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence is insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require several factors to be considered including: (1) the location/duration/frequency/intensity of an applicant's pain; (2) the type/dosage/effectiveness/side effects of any medication the applicant takes to relieve pain; (3) any treatment, other than pain medication, that the applicant has received to relieve pain; and (4) the effect of the applicant's pain on his or her ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(3). The applicant's pain must be assessed to determine the extent of his or her functional limitation(s) in light of the objective medical evidence presented. 20 CFR 416.929(c)(2).

Once an individual has been found disabled for purposes of MA benefits, continued entitlement is periodically reviewed in order to make a current determination, or decision, as to whether disability remains in accordance with the medical improvement review standard. 20 CFR 416.993(a); 20 CFR 416.994. In evaluating a claim for

ongoing MA benefits, federal regulations require a sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5). The review may cease and benefits continued if sufficient evidence supports a finding that an individual is still unable to engage in substantial gainful activity. *Id.* Prior to deciding an individual's disability has ended the Department will develop, along with the Claimant's cooperation, a complete medical history covering, at least, the 12 months preceding the date the individual signed a request seeking continuing disability benefits. 20 CFR 416.993(b). The Department may order a consultative examination to determine whether or not the disability continues. 20 CFR 416.993(c).

The first step in the analysis in determining whether an individual's disability has ended requires the trier of fact to consider the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets, or equals, a listed impairment in Appendix 1 of subpart P of part 404 of Chapter 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(i). If a Listing is met, an individual's disability is found to continue with no further analysis required.

If the impairment(s) does not meet or equal a Listing, then Step 2 requires a determination of whether there has been medical improvement as defined in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii). Medical improvement is defined as any decrease in the medical severity of the impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most favorable medical decision that the individual was disabled, or continues to be disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(i). If no medical improvement is found and no exception applies (see listed exceptions below), then an individual's disability is found to continue. Conversely, if medical improvement is found, Step 3 calls for a determination of whether there has been an increase in the residual functional capacity ("RFC") based on the impairment(s) that were present at the time of the most favorable medical determination. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iii).

If medical improvement is not related to the ability to work, Step 4 evaluates whether any listed exception applies. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iv). If no exception is applicable, disability is found to continue. *Id.* If the medical improvement is related to an individual's ability to do work, then a determination of whether an individual's impairment(s) are severe is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iii), (v). If severe, an assessment of an individual's residual functional capacity to perform past work is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vi). If an individual can perform past relevant work, disability does not continue. *Id.* Similarly, when evidence establishes that the impairment(s) do (does) not significantly limit an individual's physical, or mental, abilities to do basic work activities, continuing disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(v). Finally, if an individual is unable to perform past relevant work, vocational factors such as the individual's age, education, and past work experience are considered in determining whether despite the limitations an individual is able to perform other work. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(vii). Disability ends if an individual is able to perform other work. *Id.*

The first group of exceptions (as mentioned above) to medical improvement (i.e., when disability can be found to have ended even though medical improvement has not occurred) found in 20 CFR 416.994(b)(3) are as follows:

- (i) Substantial evidence shows that the individual is the beneficiary of advances in medical, or vocational, therapy or technology (related to the ability to work;
- (ii) Substantial evidence shows that the individual has undergone vocational therapy related to the ability to work;
- (iii) Substantial evidence shows that based on new, or improved, diagnostic, or evaluative, techniques the impairment(s) is not as disabling as previously determined at the time of the most recent favorable decision;
- (iv) Substantial evidence demonstrates that any prior disability decision was in error.

The second group of exceptions [20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)] to medical improvement are as follows:

- (i) A prior determination was fraudulently obtained;
- (ii) The individual failed to cooperate;
- (iii) The individual cannot be located;
- (iv) The prescribed treatment that was expected to restore the individual's ability to engage in substantial gainful activity was not followed.

If an exception from the second group listed above is applicable, a determination that the individual's disability has ended is made. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(iv). The second group of exceptions to medical improvement may be considered at any point in the process. *Id.*

As discussed above, the first step in the sequential evaluation process to determine whether the Claimant's disability continues looks at the severity of the impairment(s) and whether it meets, or equals, a listed impairment in Appendix 1.

At the time of the Claimant's initial approval, the Claimant had a diagnosis of shoulder injury, depression and hypertension. The Claimant was previously found disabled.

Listing:

In this case, the Claimant's diagnosis has not changed. Claimant's impairments do not meet or equal listing, 12.04 and 1.02. In light of the foregoing, a determination of whether the Claimant's condition has medically improved is necessary.

As noted above, the Claimant was previously found disabled as of March 2010. In comparing those medical records to the recent evidence (as detailed above), it is found that the Claimant's condition has not medically improved. Accordingly, the Claimant's disability is found to have continued at Step 2. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1); 20 CFR 416.994(b)(5)(ii). The Department has failed to meet its burden proving that the Claimant has had medical improvement that would warrant a finding that the Claimant is no longer disabled. The Department could not explain at hearing in what way the Claimant's health had improved.

In this case, the Claimant is found disabled for purposes of continued SDA entitlement. The Department failed to present adequate proof that Claimant has had medical improvement.


Therefore, the Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant met the Department's definition of disabled for the purposes of continued SDA.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds the Claimant disabled for purposes of continued SDA benefits.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

1. The Department's determination is **REVERSED**.
2. The Department shall initiate review of the January 2014 redetermination application for SDA to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met, and inform the Claimant of the determination.
3. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits (if any) that the Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with Department policy.
4. The Department shall review the Claimant's continued eligibility in October 2015 in accordance with Department policy.



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

Date Signed: **10/21/2014**

Date Mailed: **10/21/2014**

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:

