

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-016577-R  
Old Reg No: 2014-6382 REHD/RECON  
Issue No.: 2009  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 19, 2014  
County: Calhoun

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Aaron McClintic

**DECISION AND ORDER OF RECONSIDERATION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) 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 March 19, 2014, and mailed on June 30, 2014, in the above-captioned matter.

The Rehearing and Reconsideration process is governed by the Michigan Administrative Code, Rule 400.919, *et seq.*, 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 December 14, 2014.

**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 upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Findings of Fact No. 1 through 13 under Registration Number 2014-6382 are incorporated by reference.
2. On March 19, 2014, a hearing was held resulting in a Hearing Decision mailed on June 30, 2014, which found Claimant was not disabled.
3. On July 14, 2014, Claimant's authorized representative requested reconsideration/rehearing.
4. The Request for Rehearing/Reconsideration was GRANTED.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

In the instant case, Claimant requested rehearing/reconsideration asserting misapplication of policy under Step 2 that would impact the outcome of the original hearing decision.

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).

ALJ Scully found that Claimant did not have a severe impairment and denied at step 2. An evaluation of steps 3 through 5 was also completed and ALJ Scully found that Claimant would also have been denied at step 5.

As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). Based on the medical evidence, Claimant has presented medical evidence establishing that she does have some physical and mental limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. In support of her claim, records from 2013 and 2014 were submitted, which document treatment/diagnosis for respiratory distress, COPD, asthma, depression and anxiety. Claimant was prescribed oxygen 24 hours per day. 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 ALJ erred in finding otherwise.

In the present case, Claimant alleges disability due to respiratory distress, COPD, asthma, depression and anxiety.

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 for respiratory distress, COPD, asthma, depression and anxiety. Listing 3.00 was 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, the 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.

Claimant's past work history is that of a cook which would be considered medium exertional 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 was 51 years old, and was, thus, considered to be closely approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. Claimant has a high school education. Disability is found if an individual is unable to adjust to other work. *Id.*

At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the Claimant to the Department to present proof that the Claimant has the residual capacity to substantial gainful employment. 20 CFR 416.960(2); *Richardson v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 735 F2d 962, 964 (CA 6, 1984). While a vocational expert is not required, a finding

supported by substantial evidence that the individual has the vocational qualifications to perform specific jobs is needed to meet the burden. *O'Banner v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 587 F2d 321, 323 (CA 6, 1978). Medical-Vocational guidelines found at 20 CFR Subpart P, Appendix II, may be used to satisfy the burden of proving that the individual can perform specific jobs in the national economy. *Heckler v Campbell*, 461 US 458, 467 (1983); *Kirk v Secretary*, 667 F2d 524, 529 (CA 6, 1981) *cert den* 461 US 957 (1983).

The Department failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that Claimant has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and that given Claimant's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which Claimant could perform despite Claimant's limitations.

After careful review of the medical evidence presented and Claimant's statements, and considering the Claimant in the most restrictive circumstances this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant would be able to perform work at most on the sedentary exertional level. Claimant's use of portable oxygen and the mobility restrictions associated with that would also preclude her from performing light work.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant is capable of the requisite sitting, standing and walking for only a sedentary job. The Claimant is approaching advanced at age at 50. 20 CFR 416.963. Claimant's previous work has been unskilled. Federal Rule 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2 contains specific profiles for determining disability based on residual functional capacity and vocational profiles. Under Table 1, Rule 201.12 the Claimant is disabled for the purposes of MA. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program.

As a result, the ALJ's determination which found Claimant not disabled at Step 2 (non-severe impairment) and Step 5 (light work) are VACATED and the Department's determination which found Claimant is not disabled is REVERSED.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes Claimant is disabled for purposes of the MA program.

As a result, the ALJ's determination which found Claimant not disabled at Step 2 (non-severe impairment) and step 5 (light work) is 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 Administrative Law Judge erred in affirming the Department's determination which found Claimant not disabled.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

1. The ALJ's Hearing Decision mailed on June 30, 2014, under registration Number 2014-6382 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 June 13, 2013, 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 January, 2016, in accordance with Department policy.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



---

Aaron McClintic  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 01/20/2015

Date Mailed: 01/20/2015

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of this decision, the Claimant may appeal this decision to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives.

AM/sw

cc:

