

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-010693
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: October 16, 2014
County: Clinton

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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, telephone hearing was held on October 31, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and his authorized hearings representative [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]. The Claimant submitted additional medical documentation before the hearing that was made part of the record.

ISSUE

Did the Department of Human Services (Department) properly determine that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) based on disability?

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 6, 2014, the Claimant submitted an application for Medical Assistance (MA) benefits alleging disability.
2. On May 19, 2014, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that the Claimant did not meet the disability standard for Medical Assistance (MA-P) because it determined that his impairments do not meet the durational requirement.
3. On May 22, 2014, the Department sent the Claimant notice that it had denied the application for assistance.
4. On August 19, 2014, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the denial of disability benefits.
5. The Claimant applied for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits at the Social Security Administration (SSA).

6. The Social Security Administration (SSA) denied the Claimant's federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) application and the Claimant reported that a SSI appeal is pending.
7. The Claimant is a 38-year-old man whose birth date is [REDACTED].
8. Claimant is 5' 8" tall and weighs 116 pounds.
9. The Claimant has a high school equivalent education.
10. The Claimant is able to read and write and does have basic math skills.
11. The Claimant was not engaged in substantial gainful activity at any time relevant to this matter.
12. The Claimant has past relevant work experience in a factory as a welder where he was required to be able to lift objects weighing as much as 50 pounds.
13. The Claimant's disability claim is based on diabetes, neuropathy, heart disease, and high cholesterol.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, Rule 400.901 - 400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance has been denied. Mich Admin Code, R 400.903. Clients have the right to contest a Department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The Department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (July 1, 2013), pp 1-44.

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.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance and State Disability Assistance (SDA) programs. Under SSI, disability is defined as:

...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.

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order.

STEP 1

Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is not disabled.

At step 1, a determination is made on whether the Claimant is engaging in substantial gainful activity (20 CFR 404.1520(b) and 416.920(b)). Substantial gainful activity (SGA) is defined as work activity that is both substantial and gainful. "Substantial work activity" is work activity that involves doing significant physical or mental activities (20 CFR 404.1572(a) and 416.972(a)). "Gainful work activity" is work that is usually done for pay or profit, whether or not a profit is realized (20 CFR 404.1572(b) and 416.972(b)). Generally, if an individual has earnings from employment or self-employment above a specific level set out in the regulations, it is presumed that he has demonstrated the ability to engage in SGA (20 CFR 404.1574, 404.1575, 416.974, and 416.975). If an individual engages in SGA, he is not disabled regardless of how severe his physical or mental impairments are and regardless of his age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

The Claimant testified that he has not been employed since 2012, and is not currently engaged in substantial gainful activity, which was not disputed by the Department during the hearing. Therefore this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

STEP 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 not disabled.

At step two, a determination is made whether the Claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" or a combination of impairments that is "severe" (20 CFR 404.1520(c) and 416.920(c)). An impairment or combination of impairments is "severe" within the meaning of the regulations if it significantly limits an individual's ability to perform basic work activities. An impairment or combination of impairments is "not severe" when medical and other evidence establish only a slight abnormality or a combination of slight abnormalities that would have no more than a minimal effect on an individual's ability to work (20 CFR 404.1521 and 416.921). If the Claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he is not disabled. If the Claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments, the analysis proceeds to the third step.

The Claimant has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months, or result in death.

The Claimant is a 38-year-old man that is 5' 8" tall and weighs 116 pounds. The Claimant alleges disability due to diabetes, neuropathy, and heart disease.

The objective medical evidence indicates the following:

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent left ventriculography, left heart catheterization, selective coronary angiography, and right femoral artery closure.

On [REDACTED], the Claimant underwent quadruple bypass coronary artery grafting with endoscopic vein harvest. The Claimant's treating physician limited his activity to no lifting, driving, or strenuous exercise for four weeks. On [REDACTED], the Claimant's treating physician found no evidence of acute cardiopulmonary disease. On [REDACTED], the Claimant sought treatment for chronic chest pain but treating physicians found his pain was likely due to mild acid reflux. On [REDACTED], treating physicians found the Claimant to have no physical or mental limitations.

The Claimant has been diagnosed by treating physicians with diabetic ketoacidosis and requiring inpatient treatment secondary to untreated diabetes and failure to take insulin. Treating physicians suspected malingering and drug seeking behavior.

The evidence on the record indicates that the Claimant's was been diagnosed with diabetes by treating physicians and that he has a history of heart disease. The Claimant's heart disease has been surgically treated and no longer prevents him from performing any work related tasks. The Claimant's diabetes requires lifelong daily insulin treatments. The Claimant's impairments due to diabetes are likely to improve with treatment and the evidence on the record does not indicate that he has suffered from severe impairments in another body system as a result of his diabetes.

The objective medical evidence of record is not sufficient to establish that Claimant has severe impairments that have lasted or are expected to last 12 months or more and prevent employment at any job for 12 months or more. Therefore, Claimant is found not to be disabled at this step. In order to conduct a thorough evaluation of Claimant's disability assertion, the analysis will continue.

STEP 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? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4.

At step three, a determination is made whether the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of an impairment listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, 404.1526, 416.920(d), 416.925, and 416.926). If the Claimant's impairment or combination of impairments is of a severity to meet or medically equal the criteria of a listing and meets the duration requirement (20 CFR 404.1509 and 416.909), the Claimant is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for diabetes under section 9.00 Endocrine because the objective medical evidence on the record does not demonstrate severe damage in any body system or other severe impairment as a result of his diabetes.

The Claimant's impairment failed to meet the listing for neuropathy under section 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint because the objective medical evidence does not demonstrate that the Claimant's impairment involves a weight bearing joint resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, or impairment in each upper extremity resulting in inability to perform fine and gross

movements effectively. Inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively includes the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level. On [REDACTED], the Claimant was self-ambulatory without distress. The Claimant's neuropathy is a severe impairment only when his diabetes remains untreated.

The Claimant's impairments failed to meet any lifting for heart disease under section 4.00 Cardiovascular System. Treating physicians found no evidence of acute cardiopulmonary disease on [REDACTED], following surgical treatment in September.

The medical evidence of the Claimant's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in federal code of regulations 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1.

STEP 4

Can the client do the former work that he performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is not disabled.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, a determination is made of the Claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(c)). An individual's residual functional capacity is his ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from his impairments. In making this finding, the undersigned must consider all of the Claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, a determination is made on whether the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his past relevant work (20 CFR 404.1520(f) and 416.920(f)). The term past relevant work means work performed (either as the Claimant actually performed it or as it is generally performed in the national economy) within the last 15 years or 15 years prior to the date that disability must be established. In addition, the work must have lasted long enough for the Claimant to learn to do the job and have been SGA (20 CFR 404.1560(b), 404.1565, 416.960(b), and 416.965). If the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do his past relevant work, the Claimant is not disabled. If the Claimant is unable to do any past relevant work or does not have any past relevant work, the analysis proceeds to the fifth and last step.

To determine the physical demands (exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, we classify jobs as sedentary, light, medium, and heavy. These terms have the same meaning as they have in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, published by the Department of Labor... 20 CFR 416.967.

Light work. Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 10 pounds. Even though the weight lifted may be very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing and pulling of arm or leg controls... 20 CFR 416.967(b).

To determine the skills required in the national economy of work you are able to do, occupations are classified as unskilled, semi-skilled, and skilled. These terms have the same meaning as defined in. 20 CFR 416.968.

Semi-skilled work. Semi-skilled work is work which needs some skills but does not require doing the more complex work duties. Semi-skilled jobs may require alertness and close attention to watching machine processes; or inspecting, testing or otherwise looking for irregularities; or tending or guarding equipment, property, materials, or persons against loss, damage or injury; or other types of activities which are similarly less complex than skilled work, but more complex than unskilled work. A job may be classified as semi-skilled where coordination and dexterity are necessary, as when hands or feet must be moved quickly to do repetitive tasks. 20 CFR 416.968(b).

The Claimant has past relevant work experience working in a factory as a welder where he was required to lift objects weighing as much as 50 pounds, which is considered medium work. The Claimant's work as a welder fits the definition of semi-skilled work because of the skill and attention to detail that is required. The Claimant's heart disease has been surgically treated and his condition has improved. The Claimant's diabetes is amendable to treatment and his neuropathy is secondary impairment subject to his diabetes. After careful consideration of the entire record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567 and 416.967.

There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that the Claimant is able to perform work substantially similar to work performed in the past.

STEP 5

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that the Claimant has the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) for Substantial Gainful Activity.

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? If yes, client is not disabled.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), a determination is made whether the Claimant is able to do any other work considering his residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the Claimant is able to do other work, he is not disabled. If the Claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirement, he is disabled.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated.... 20 CFR 416.945(a).

The objective medical evidence indicates that the Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment and that he is physically able to do less strenuous tasks if demanded of him. The Claimant is capable of sweeping floors, washing laundry, and washing dishes. The Claimant testified that he

performs these tasks slowly, but the evidence on the record supports finding that his impairments do not prevent him from performing them when he follows recommended treatments for his diabetes. The Claimant's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work.


Medical vocational guidelines have been developed and can be found in 20 CFR, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Section 200.00. When the facts coincide with a particular guideline, the guideline directs a conclusion as to disability. 20 CFR 416.969.

Claimant is 38-years-old, a younger person, under age 50, with a high school equivalent education, and a history of semi-skilled work. Based on the objective medical evidence of record Claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform light work. Medical Assistance (M.A.) is denied using Vocational Rule 202.21 as a guideline.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds Claimant not disabled for purposes of the Medical Assistance (M.A.) benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.


Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **11/3/2014**

Date Mailed: **11/3/2014**

KS/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:

