

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-009424  
Issue No.: 4009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: October 09, 2014  
County: Kent-District 1 (Franklin)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne Harris

**HEARING DECISION**

Following the 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 October 9, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included [REDACTED] and her Authorized Hearing Representative and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearing Facilitator, [REDACTED].

The record was extended to allow additional relevant medical evidence to be submitted. The Claimant waived timeliness. The Claimant also brought additional medical evidence to the hearing with her. That was sent to the Administrative Law Judge via facsimile directly after the hearing. The Claimant was instructed that held though the record was held open, if the Administrative Law Judge had sufficient evidence to approve her for SDA upon the receipt of the faxed information, the Administrative Law Judge would close the record and proceed directly to a decision without the additional information. The Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative had no objection to proceeding in this manner. The Administrative Law Judge proceeds to a decision without the additional medical for which the record was extended.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that the Claimant is not "disabled" for the purpose of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) program?

**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 March 18, 2014, the Claimant applied for SDA.

2. On July 14, 2014, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied the Claimant's request.
3. On August 8, 2014, the Claimant submitted to the Department a request for hearing.
4. The Claimant was [REDACTED].
5. The Claimant completed education through an [REDACTED].
6. The Claimant has very little employment experience (last worked [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]).
7. The Claimant suffers from migraines, anxiety, depression, mood disorder, learning disorder, dyslexia, right shoulder and elbow pain, and back and hip pain.
8. The Claimant's limitations have lasted for 12 months or more.
9. The Claimant has significant limitations on understanding, carrying out, and remembering simple instructions; use of judgment; responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

MA-P 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 administers MA-P 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 Bridges Reference Manual (RFT).

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under MA-P. 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 are 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.

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 symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

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).

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, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

The Claimant testified that she suffers from serious mental disabilities and has problems concentrating, memory problems, and crying spells every day. She has anxiety attacks. She has attended [REDACTED] and becomes afraid that the faculty there will attack her. The persuasive, objective psychiatric evidence in the record indicates that the Claimant is markedly limited in the following categories:

1. The ability to understand and remember detailed instructions.
2. The ability to carry out detailed instructions.
3. The ability to maintain attention and concentration for extended periods.
4. The ability to work in coordination with or proximity with others without being distracted by them.
5. The ability to make simple work-related decisions.
6. The ability to complete a normal workday and workweek without interruptions from psychologically-based symptoms and to perform at a consistent pace without an unreasonable number and length of rest periods.
7. The ability to interact appropriately with the general public.
8. The ability to accept instructions and respond appropriately to criticism from supervisors.
9. The ability to get along with coworkers or peers without distracting them or exhibiting behavioral extremes.
10. The ability to respond appropriately to changes in the work setting.
11. The ability to travel in unfamiliar places or use public transportation.
12. The ability to set realistic goals or make plans independently of others.

The persuasive, objective psychiatric evidence in the record indicates that the Claimant is also moderately limited in seven other categories.

In this case, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant may be considered presently disabled at the third step. The Claimant appears to meet listing 12.04 or its equivalent. This Administrative Law Judge will not continue through the remaining steps of the assessment. The Claimant's testimony and the medical documentation support the finding that the Claimant meets the requirements of a listing.

Therefore, Claimant is found to be disabled.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Claimant is medically disabled as of March 2014.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby **REVERSED** and the Department is ORDERED to initiate a review of the application dated March 18, 2014, if not done previously, to determine the Claimant's non-medical eligibility. The Department shall inform the Claimant of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for March 2016.



---

**Susanne Harris**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **10/20/2014**

Date Mailed: **10/20/2014**

**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

SEH / tb

cc:

