

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-009618
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 29, 2014
County: St. Clair

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki Armstrong

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 October 29, 2014, from Port Huron, Michigan. Claimant, accompanied by his wife, appeared and testified. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included General Program Services Manager [REDACTED].

ISSUE

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. On March 28, 2014, Claimant filed an application for MA/Retro-MA benefits alleging disability.
2. On May 2, 2014, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA/Retro-MA.
3. On May 15, 2014, the Department sent Claimant notice that his application for MA/Retro-MA had been denied.
4. On August 15, 2014, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
5. Claimant was appealing the denial of Social Security disability benefits at the time of the hearing.
6. Claimant is a 51 year old man whose birthday is [REDACTED]. Claimant is 5'11" tall and weighs 310 lbs.

7. Claimant does not have an alcohol, nicotine or drug history.
8. Claimant does have a driver's license but is afraid to drive due to his multiple impairments.
9. Claimant has a high school education.
10. Claimant is not currently working. Claimant last worked in June, 2013.
11. Claimant alleges disability on the basis of morbid obesity, congestive heart failure, obstructive sleep apnea, arthritis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, edema, hypertension and left shoulder pain.
12. Claimant's impairments have lasted, or are expected to last, continuously for a period of twelve months or longer.
13. Claimant's complaints and allegations concerning his impairments and limitations, when considered in light of all objective medical evidence, as well as the record as a whole, reflect an individual who is so impaired as to be incapable of engaging in any substantial gainful activity on a regular and continuing basis.

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.

In order to receive MA benefits based upon disability or blindness, claimant must be disabled or blind as defined in Title XVI of the Social Security Act (20 CFR 416.901). DHS, being authorized to make such disability determinations, utilizes the SSI definition of disability when making medical decisions on MA applications. MA-P (disability), also is known as Medicaid, which is a program designated to help public assistance claimants pay their medical expenses. Michigan administers the federal Medicaid program. In assessing eligibility, Michigan utilizes the federal regulations.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

"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.

The federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

. . . We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further. 20 CFR 416.920.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b). If no, the analysis continues to Step 2.
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 ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.909(c).
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 that meets the duration requirement? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. Sections 200.00-204.00(f)?

5. 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? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do other work. If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application Claimant has the burden of proof pursuant to:

. . . You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required by claimant to establish statutory disability. The regulations essentially require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate claimant's claims or claimant's physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

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 ultrasounds, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms). 20 CFR 416.913(b).

Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment. 20 CFR 416.929(a). The medical evidence must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e). You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(1).

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).

Applying the sequential analysis herein, Claimant is not ineligible at the first step as Claimant is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). This second step is a *de minimus* standard. Ruling any ambiguities in Claimant's favor, this Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that Claimant meets both. The analysis continues.

In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if the individual's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. Claimant has alleged physical disabling impairments due to morbid obesity, congestive heart failure, obstructive sleep apnea, arthritis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, edema, hypertension and left shoulder pain.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), Listing 3.00 (respiratory system), and Listing 4.00 (cardiovascular system), were considered in light of the objective evidence. Based on the foregoing, it is found that Claimant's impairment(s) do not meet the intent and severity requirement of a listed impairment; therefore, Claimant cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 3. Accordingly, Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Claimant was hospitalized on [REDACTED], for bilateral pneumonia, acute congestive heart failure, shortness of breath, hepatitis, possible hepatic coagulopathy, acute respiratory failure, and bilateral lower extremity cellulitis. Claimant was discharged on [REDACTED], with a diagnosis of acute systolic heart failure with ejection fraction less than 20% per echocardiogram, community-acquired pneumonia, bilateral lower extremity wounds, hyperkalemia resolved, hyponatremia resolved, cellulitis improved, hepatitis secondary to hepatic congestion from acute systolic heart failure, hepatic coagulopathy, acute respiratory failure upon admission improved, morbid obesity and hypomagnesemia resolved. Claimant could not be weaned off oxygen due to hypoxia, therefore he was discharged home with home oxygen.

On [REDACTED], Claimant underwent a sleep evaluation. He had advanced cardiomyopathy and a biventricular failure with an ejection fraction less than 10%. He was still on oxygen since being released from the hospital in February, 2014. Based on the consultation, Claimant was diagnosed with suspected sleep apnea syndrome, obstructive versus central in a setting of severe cardiomyopathy with biventricular failure. He was to be scheduled for a screening polysomnogram.

In April, 2014, Claimant underwent cardiac catheterization revealing Claimant had a severely impaired left ventricular systolic function.

A June, 2014, echocardiogram report indicates Claimant's ejection fraction is 50% with a left ventricular filling pattern consistent with diastolic dysfunction, moderate hypertrophy, mildly dilated right ventricle with normal function, moderately dilated left atrium, mildly dilated right atrium, abnormal trileaflet aortic valve, mild to moderate aortic regurgitation, mild mitral regurgitation, mild tricuspid regurgitation, mildly increased PASP, and physiologic pulmonic regurgitation.

Claimant's treating physician completed a Medical Examination Report on behalf of the Department on [REDACTED]. Claimant is diagnosed with congestive heart failure, sleep apnea, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hypertension, left shoulder pain, obesity, left knee pain and edema. The physician noted Claimant is limited to occasionally lifting less than 10 pounds, standing and/or walking less than 2 hours in an 8 hour workday, and sitting less than 6 hours in an 8 hour workday. Based on the examination, the treating physician opined that Claimant's condition is deteriorating.

Claimant has been medically described as morbidly obese which condition likely exacerbates his impairments.

Obesity is a medically determinable impairment that is often associated with disturbance of the respiratory system, and disturbance of this system can be a major cause of disability in individuals with obesity. The combined effects of obesity with respiratory impairments can be greater than the effects of each of the impairments considered separately. Therefore, when determining whether an individual with obesity has a listing-level impairment or combination of impairments, and when assessing a claim at other steps of the sequential evaluation process, including when assessing an individual's residual functional capacity, adjudicators must consider any additional and cumulative effects of obesity. Listing 3.00(I).

The fourth step of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. This step examines the physical and mental demands of the work done by Claimant in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f). Claimant's past work history is that of a warehouse supervisor and as such, Claimant would be unable to perform the duties associated with his past work. Likewise, Claimant's past work skills will not transfer to other occupations. Accordingly, Step 5 of the sequential analysis is required.

The fifth and final step of the analysis applies the biographical data of the applicant to the Medical Vocational Grids to determine the residual functional capacity of the applicant to do other work. 20 CFR 416.920(g). See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once Claimant reaches Step 5 in the sequential review process, Claimant has already established a *prima facie* case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962 (6th Cir, 1984). At that point, the burden of proof is on the state to prove by substantial evidence that Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity.

The medical information indicates that Claimant suffers from morbid obesity, congestive heart failure, obstructive sleep apnea, arthritis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, edema, hypertension and left shoulder pain.

Claimant credibly testified that he has a limited tolerance for physical activities and is unable to stand or sit for lengthy periods of time. Claimant requires oxygen 24 hours a day, since leaving the hospital in February, 2014. Claimant stated he is very weak and when walking if forced to stop to catch his breath after 10 minutes.

After careful review of Claimant's medical records and the Administrative Law Judge's personal interaction with Claimant at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant's non-exertional impairments render Claimant unable to engage in a full range of even sedentary work activities on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P. Appendix 11, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986). Based on Claimant's vocational profile (approaching advanced age, Claimant is 51, with a high school education and an unskilled work history), this Administrative Law Judge finds Claimant's MA/Retro-MA benefits are approved using Vocational Rule 201.12 as a guide. Consequently, the Department's denial of his March 28, 2014, MA/Retro-MA application cannot be upheld.

DECISION AND ORDER


The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides the Department erred in determining Claimant is not currently disabled for MA/Retro-MA eligibility purposes.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **REVERSED**, and it is ORDERED that:

1. The Department shall process Claimant's March 28, 2014, MA/Retro-MA application, and shall award him all the benefits he may be entitled to receive, as long as he meets the remaining financial and non-financial eligibility factors.
2. The Department shall review Claimant's medical condition for improvement in November, 2015, unless his Social Security Administration disability status is approved by that time.

3. The Department shall obtain updated medical evidence from Claimant's treating physicians, physical therapists, pain clinic notes, etc. regarding his continued treatment, progress and prognosis at review.

It is SO ORDERED.


Vicki Armstrong
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **10/31/2014**

Date Mailed: **10/31/2014**

VLA/las

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:

