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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[redacted]

Reg. No.: 14-003355
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [redacted]
Hearing Date: October 2, 2014
County: Oakland (04)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

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; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, an in-person hearing was held on October 2, 2014, from Pontiac, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant. [redacted] testified and appeared as Claimant's authorized hearing representative (AHR). Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (DHS) included [redacted], Specialist.

ISSUE

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) for the reason that Claimant is not a disabled individual.

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 [redacted], Claimant applied for MA benefits, including retroactive MA benefits from 11/2013 (see Exhibits 13-14).

2. Claimant's only basis for MA benefits was as a disabled individual.

3. On [redacted], the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 1-2).

4. On [redacted], DHS denied Claimant's application for MA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action informing Claimant of the denial.

5. On [redacted], Claimant's AHR requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA benefits.

6. On [redacted] SHRT determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual, in part, by determining that Claimant does not have a severe impairment.

7. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 52 year old male with a height of 6'5'' and weight of 349 pounds.

8. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12th grade.

9. Claimant alleged disability based on impairments and issues including knee pain, back pain, and diabetes.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105. Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) and Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Medicaid program is comprised of several sub-programs which fall under one of two categories; one category is FIP-related and the second category is SSI-related. BEM 105 (10/2010), p. 1. To receive MA under an SSI-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled. *Id*. Families with dependent children, caretaker relatives of dependent children, persons under age 21 and pregnant, or recently pregnant, women receive MA under FIP-related categories. *Id*. AMP is an MA program available to persons not eligible for Medicaid through the SSI-related or FIP-related categories though DHS does always offer the program to applicants. It was not disputed that Claimant's only potential category for Medicaid eligibility would be as a disabled individual.

Disability for purposes of MA benefits is established if one of the following circumstances applies:

- by death (for the month of death);
- the applicant receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits;
- SSI benefits were recently terminated due to financial factors;
- the applicant receives Retirement Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) on the basis of being disabled; or

- RSDI eligibility is established following denial of the MA benefit application (under certain circumstances).
  BEM 260 (7/2012) pp. 1-2

There was no evidence that any of the above circumstances apply to Claimant. Accordingly, Claimant may not be considered for Medicaid eligibility without undergoing a medical review process which determines whether Claimant is a disabled individual. *Id*., p. 2.

Generally, state agencies such as DHS must use the same definition of SSI disability as found in the federal regulations. 42 CFR 435.540(a). Disability is federally defined as the inability to do any substantial gainful activity (SGA) 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 functionally identical definition of disability is found under DHS regulations. BEM 260 (7/2012), p. 8.

Substantial gainful activity means a person does the following:
- Performs significant duties, and
- Does them for a reasonable length of time, and
- Does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id*., p. 9.

Significant duties are duties used to do a job or run a business. *Id*. They must also have a degree of economic value. *Id*. The ability to run a household or take care of oneself does not, on its own, constitute substantial gainful activity. *Id*.

The person claiming a physical or mental disability has the burden to establish a disability 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 CRF 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).

Federal regulations describe a sequential five step process that is to be followed in determining whether a person is disabled. 20 CFR 416.920. If there is no finding of disability or lack of disability at each step, the process moves to the next step. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4).

The first step in the process considers a person's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(i). A person who is earning more than a certain monthly amount is ordinarily considered to be engaging in SGA. The monthly amount depends on whether a person is statutorily blind or not. "Current" work activity is interpreted to include all time since the date of application. The 2013 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is $1,040.

Claimant testified that he worked for a grocery store for $14.72/hour. Claimant testified that he has to limit his hours due to physical limitations. Claimant estimated that he works 10-12 hours per week. Claimant's testimony was credible and unrefuted. Claimant's gross income is substantially less than presumptive SGA income limits, even accepting that Claimant works a maximum of 12 hours per week. It is found that Claimant is not performing SGA and has not performed SGA since the date of MA application. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to step two.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the 12 month duration requirement. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(ii). The impairments may be combined to meet the severity requirement. If a severe impairment is not found, then a person is deemed not disabled. *Id*.

The impairments must significantly limit a person's basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(5)(c). "Basic work activities" refers to the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. *Id.* Examples of basic work activities include:

- physical functions (e.g. walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling)
- capacities for seeing, hearing, and speaking, understanding; carrying out, and remembering simple instructions
- use of judgment
- responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and/or
- dealing with changes in a routine work setting.

Generally, federal courts have imposed a de minimus standard upon claimants to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10th Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10th Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen,* 880 F2d 860, 862 (6th Cir. 1988). Similarly, Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been interpreted so that a claim may be denied at step two for lack of a severe impairment only when the medical evidence establishes a slight abnormality or combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work even if the individual's age, education, or work experience were specifically considered. *Barrientos v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 820 F.2d 1, 2 (1st Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirement is intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1st Cir. 1986).

SSA specifically notes that age, education, and work experience are not considered at the second step of the disability analysis. 20 CFR 416.920 (5)(c). In determining whether Claimant's impairments amount to a severe impairment, all other relevant evidence may be considered. The analysis will begin with a summary of the relevant submitted medical documentation.

A treating physician letter (Exhibit A1; B1) dated [redacted] was presented. The physician stated that Claimant was unable to work more than 3 days per week, no more than 2 days in a row, and no more than 4 hours per day.

A physician letter (Exhibit A2; B2) dated [redacted] was presented. The treating physician stated that Claimant should be excused from work due to ailments for the period of [redacted]. Previous restrictions were reiterated including the addition of a 4 hour/day limit on standing.

A physician letter (Exhibit A3; B3) dated [redacted] was presented. The treating physician stated that Claimant could return to employment subject to previously described restrictions.

The letters were also not accompanied with any details to justify the stated restrictions. Deference can be given to a physician opinion of restrictions, however, some modicum of treatment details must justify the restrictions.

The absence of even a diagnosis to justify the restriction makes it impossible to infer that the restrictions would continue 4-5 years after the letters were authored. It is reasonably possible that Claimant's health improved since the physician letters were authored. Overall, the 2009 and 2010 dated physician letters provide little insight into Claimant's current health.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 75-99) from an admission dated [redacted] were presented. The documents concerned an admission for a patient with the same name but different birthdate from Claimant. The documents were not considered in the disability analysis.

Hospital documents (Exhibits 15-74) from an admission dated [redacted] were presented. Hospital documents noted that Claimant presented following upper left arm pain, ongoing for approximately one week. It was noted that abscesses covered more than 50% of his Claimant's left arm. It was noted that Claimant underwent incision and debridement. Left upper venous testing demonstrated a low probability of deep vein thrombosis. An impression of subcutaneous abscess secondary to a spider bite was noted following upper extremity ultrasound testing. It was noted that Claimant was insulin dependent. A medical history of hypertension, hyperlipidemia and obesity was noted; HTN and DM were described as poorly controlled. Trace lower extremity edema was noted. Noted discharge diagnoses included left arm cellulitis and abscess. A discharge date of [redacted] was noted. Discharge instructions included follow-up for outpatient wound care.

Physician office visit documents (Exhibits 110-112) dated [redacted] were presented. It was noted that Claimant was treated for DM. Active medications were noted to include Norvasc, Lopid, low dose aspirin, and insulin. Lab results dated [redacted] were also presented (see Exhibits 107-109).

Physician office visit documents (Exhibits 103-106) dated [redacted] were presented. It was noted that Claimant complained of back, arm, and neck pain. The pain was noted as relieved by medications. It was noted that Claimant reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident from [redacted] Noted chronic problems included osteoarthritis, morbid obesity, mixed hyperlipidemia, controlled DM, and unspecified essential HTN. Noted instructions included continuing Ibuprofen and heating pad for pain management. An x-rays of Claimant's knees was ordered. Back pain was described as "mild". It was noted that Claimant was negative for gait disturbance.

Physician office visit documents (Exhibits B6-B9) dated [redacted] were presented. It was noted that Claimant appeared for an annual physical. Back pain and mild dyspnea were noted. Claimant's gait was noted as unsteady.

Presented documents verified some degree of restriction related to lumbar pain dyspnea, and lingering pain associated with a spider bite. It is found that Claimant established severe impairments and the analysis may proceed to step three.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires a determination whether the Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If Claimant's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the 12 month requirement, then the claimant is deemed disabled. If the impairment is unlisted, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

A listing for joint dysfunction (Listing 1.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaints of knee pain. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish that Claimant is unable to ambulate effectively.

A listing for spinal disorders (Listing 1.04) was considered based on Claimant's LBP complaints. This listing was rejected due to a failure to establish a spinal disorder resulting in a compromised nerve root.

A listing for chronic pulmonary insufficiency (Listing 3.02) was considered based on Claimant's complaints of dyspnea. The listing was rejected due to a lack of respiratory testing evidence.

It is found that Claimant failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves to step four.

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (RFC) and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if it is determined that a claimant can perform past relevant work. *Id*.

Past relevant work is work that has been performed within the past 15 years that was a substantial gainful activity and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1). Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy is not considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). RFC is assessed based on impairment(s), and any related symptoms, such as pain, which may cause physical and mental limitations that affect what can be done in a work setting. RFC is the most that can be done, despite the limitations.

Claimant's past employment involved work at a call center. Claimant testified that he held the job for approximately three years. Claimant testified that 100% of his employment was answering telephone calls.

Claimant also testified he had past employment as a document inspector. Claimant testified that his job was to check scanned documents to insure that they were properly scanned.

Claimant likely has some degree of standing and respiratory restrictions which may inhibit his current employment as a deli store clerk. Claimant's impairments would not inhibit Claimant's past employment as either a document inspector or as a call center representative. It is found that Claimant can perform past employment. Accordingly, Claimant is not a disabled individual and it is found that DHS properly denied Claimant's MA application.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS properly denied Claimant's MA benefit application dated [redacted], including retroactive MA benefits from 11/2013, based on a determination that Claimant is not disabled. The actions taken by DHS are **AFFIRMED**.

Christian Gardocki

Christian Gardocki
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **11/19/2014**

Date Mailed: **11/19/2014**

CG / hw

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: [redacted]