


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 14-009011-RECON
REHD/RECON
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 28, 2014
County: Wayne-District 17 (Greenfield)

SUPERVISING ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

DECISION AND ORDER OF RECONSIDERATION

This matter is before the undersigned Supervising Administrative Law Judge (SALJ) pursuant to the Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative's (AHR) timely Request for Rehearing/ Reconsideration of the Hearing Decision generated by the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) at the conclusion of the hearing conducted on October 28, 2014, and mailed on January 13, 2015, in the above-captioned matter.

The Rehearing and Reconsideration process is governed by the Michigan Administrative Code, Rule 792.11015 and applicable policy provisions articulated in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), specifically BAM 600, which provide that a rehearing or reconsideration must be filed in a timely manner consistent with the statutory requirements of the particular program or programs that is the basis for the claimant's benefits application, and **may** be granted so long as the reasons for which the request is made comply with the policy and statutory requirements.

This matter having been reviewed, an Order Granting Reconsideration was mailed on March 26, 2015.

ISSUE

Whether the ALJ erred when she affirmed the Department's decision that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefit program?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Findings of Fact Numbers 1 through 6 under Registration Number 14-009011 are incorporated by reference.

2. On October 28, 2014, a hearing was held resulting in a Hearing Decision mailed on January 13, 2015.
3. On February 10, 2015, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) received the Claimant's Request for Rehearing/Reconsideration.
4. On March 26, 2015, the MAHS issued an Order Granting Reconsideration.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

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.

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).

In order to determine whether or not an individual is disabled, federal regulations require a five-step sequential evaluation process be utilized. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1). The five-step analysis requires the trier of fact to consider an individual's current work activity; the severity of the impairment(s) both in duration and whether it meets or equals a listed impairment in Appendix 1; residual functional capacity to determine whether an individual can perform past relevant work; and residual functional capacity along with vocational factors (e.g., age, education, and work experience) to determine if an individual can adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945.

If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled, at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If an impairment does not meet or equal a listed impairment, an individual's residual functional capacity is assessed before moving from Step 3 to Step 4. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4); 20 CFR 416.945. Residual functional capacity is the most an individual can do despite the limitations based on all relevant evidence. 20 CFR 945(a)(1). An individual's residual functional capacity assessment is evaluated at both Steps 4 and 5. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). In determining disability, an individual's functional capacity to perform basic work activities is evaluated and if found that the individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitation, disability will not be found. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv). In general, the individual has the responsibility to prove disability. 20 CFR 416.912(a). An impairment or combination of impairments is not severe if it does not significantly limit an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.921(a). The individual has the responsibility to provide evidence of prior work experience; efforts to work; and any other factor showing how the impairment affects the ability to work. 20 CFR 416.912(c)(3)(5)(6).

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).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, Claimant last worked in 2003, and is not involved in substantial gainful activity. Therefore, he is not disqualified from receiving disability benefits under Step 1.

The severity of the individual's alleged impairment(s) is considered under Step 2. The individual bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. In order to be considered disabled for MA purposes, the impairment must be severe. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR

916.920(b). An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities regardless of age, education and work experience. 20 CFR 916.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 916.920(c). Basic work activities means the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. 20 CFR 916.921(b). Examples include:

1. Physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, 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. *Id.*

The second step allows for dismissal of a disability claim obviously lacking in medical merit. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862 (CA 6, 1988). The severity requirement may still be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint. *Id.* at 863 *citing Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). An impairment qualifies as non-severe only if, regardless of a claimant's age, education, or work experience, the impairment would not affect the claimant's ability to work. *Salmi v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 774 F2d 685, 692 (CA 6, 1985).

In the present case, Claimant alleges disability due to the following: difficulty walking, a bleeding ulcer, glaucoma in the right eye, prior renal cell carcinoma, left nephrectomy, polysubstance abuse, gastroesophageal reflux disease, hard of hearing, tinnitus, gastric resection for benign tumor, anemia, high blood pressure, carpal tunnel syndrome in both hands and arthritis.

In support of his claim, Claimant submitted the following medical records from 2013. On [REDACTED], Claimant was admitted to the hospital for rectal bleeding and black tarry stools, likely secondary to upper GI bleed. Claimant was given 2 units of packed red cells. On the medical floor, he was NPO and GI was consulted resulting in another 4 units of blood transfused. Claimant was discharged on October 25, 2013, with a diagnosis of abdominal pain, likely secondary to gastric ulcer versus gastritis; H. pylori; iron deficiency anemia; coagulopathy of unknown etiology; acute blood loss anemia secondary to upper GI bleeding resulting in 6 units of blood transfused; and melena.

On [REDACTED], Claimant presented to the emergency department with bloody stools. Claimant was assessed with intermittent blood stools, history of peptic ulcer disease, history of renal cell carcinoma and hypertension. Claimant was admitted to the hospital and was scheduled the following day for a colonoscopy.

On [REDACTED], Claimant underwent an independent medical evaluation. The examining physician opined that Claimant has multiple chronic medical problems for which he needs long-term, ongoing care as well as investigation. The examiner found that Claimant does hear if you speak louder but probably needs an updated ear exam. It was found that Claimant also has tinnitus. He had a number of medical problems which required further investigation, according to the examining physician, and he found they represented end organ failure with glaucoma and hypertension and poor blood pressure control as well as arthritis. Claimant was found to have difficulty with prolonged standing, stooping, squatting, lifting, and bending. Claimant had no current primary care doctor but was taking medication which he has received in the past.

During the hearing, Claimant testified that he was in constant pain which prevented him from sleeping and kept him awake at night. He stated he also had problems walking.

As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. Based on the objective medical records, Claimant presented evidence establishing that he does have some physical limitations on his ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that Claimant has an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on the Claimant's basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for twelve months; therefore, Claimant is not disqualified from receipt of MA-P benefits under Step 2 and the undersigned finds that the assigned ALJ erred in finding otherwise.

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. The evidence confirms treatment/diagnoses of difficulty walking, a bleeding ulcer, glaucoma in the right eye, prior renal cell carcinoma, left nephrectomy, polysubstance abuse, gastroesophageal reflux disease, hard of hearing, tinnitus, gastric resection for benign tumor, anemia, high blood pressure, carpal tunnel syndrome in both hands and arthritis.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system), and Listing 5.00 (digestive 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 at Step 3. Accordingly, Claimant's eligibility is considered under Step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity ("RFC") and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if he/she can perform past relevant work. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3). 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 are 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.

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 mechanic 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.

In Step 5, an assessment of the individual's residual functional capacity and age, education, and work experience is considered to determine whether an adjustment to other work can be made. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v). At the time of hearing, Claimant had graduated from high school, was 55 years old and was, thus, considered to be an advanced individual for MA-P purposes. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.*

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.

After careful review of Claimant's medical records as well as the digital recording of the hearing, the undersigned finds that Claimant's non-exertional and 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 (advanced age, Claimant is 55, with a high school education and a skilled work history), this Administrative Law Judge finds Claimant's MA/Retro-MA benefits should be approved using Vocational Rule 201.06 as a guide.

As a result, the assigned ALJ's determinations that Claimant is either not disabled at Step 2 (non-severe impairment), and/or, alternatively, not disabled at Step 5 (residual functional capacity) are VACATED and the Department's determination which found Claimant is not disabled is REVERSED.


DECISION AND ORDER

Based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, it is determined that the assigned Administrative Law Judge erred when she found that Claimant was not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program.

Accordingly, the Supervising Administrative Law Judge finds the following:

1. The ALJ's Hearing Decision mailed on January 13, 2015, under registration Number 14-009011 which found Claimant not disabled is VACATED.
2. The Department's determination which found Claimant not disabled is REVERSED.
3. The Department shall initiate processing of the January 16, 2014, application to include any applicable requested retroactive months, to determine if all other non-medical criteria are met and inform Claimant of the determination in accordance with Department policy.
4. The Department shall supplement for any lost benefits (if any) that Claimant was entitled to receive if otherwise eligible and qualified in accordance with Department policy.
5. The Department shall review Claimant's continued eligibility in May, 2016, in accordance with Department policy.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



C. Adam Purnell
Supervising Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: 05/28/2015

Date Mailed: 05/28/2015

NOTICE: The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of the this Decision, the Claimant may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives or the circuit court in Ingham County.

CAP/sw

cc:

