


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-11760
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 6, 2014
County: Wayne (43)

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, a telephone hearing was held on March 6, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named Claimant. 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) and State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 and SDA benefits.
2. Claimant's only basis for MA and SDA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On [REDACTED] the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual (see Exhibits 2-3).

4. On [REDACTED], DHS denied Claimant's application for MA and SDA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action informing Claimant of the denial.
5. On [REDACTED] Claimant requested a hearing disputing the denial of MA and SDA benefits.
6. On [REDACTED], SHRT determined that Claimant was not a disabled individual, in part, by application of Medical-Vocational Rule 202.21.
7. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was a 42-year-old male with a height of 5'7" and weight of 153 pounds.
8. Claimant has no known relevant history of alcohol or illegal substance abuse.
9. Claimant's highest education year completed was the 12th grade.
10. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Claimant was an Adult Medical Program recipient since 4/2013.
11. Claimant alleged disability based on impairments and issues including kidney disease, asthma, hip pain and carpal-tunnel syndrome.

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.* at 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.* at 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 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).

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. The 2013 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,040.

Claimant credibly denied performing any employment since the date of the MA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Claimant's testimony. Based on the presented evidence, 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 F.2d 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 medical background gleaned

from Claimant's testimony and a summary of the relevant submitted medical documentation.

Claimant testified that his left hip has deteriorated to the point where he needs hip replacement surgery. Claimant also stated that he has an old gunshot wound in his right hand that causes grasping restrictions.

A Disability Determination Explanation (Exhibits 22-30) dated [REDACTED] was presented. The documents were completed by a disability adjudicator and cosigned by a physician. A residual functional capacity assessment noted that Claimant could occasionally lift or carry up to 20 pounds. The assessment noted that Claimant could frequently lift 10 pounds. It was assessed that Claimant could stand or sit about 6 hours in an 8-hour workday. A determination that Claimant could perform light employment was noted.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibits 16-18) dated [REDACTED] from Claimant's treating physician was presented. The physician noted an approximate 5-month history of treating Claimant. The physician provided diagnoses of minimal change disease, hyperlipidemia and asthma. An impression was given that Claimant's condition was deteriorating. A positive Patrick's test was noted. Marked decreased range of motion was noted in Claimant's left hip. The physician restricted Claimant to occasional lifting/carrying of less than 10 pounds; never 10 pounds or more. The physician noted that Claimant could stand or walk less than 2 hours of an 8-hour workday. The physician noted that Claimant could sit less than 6 hours in an 8-hour workday. The physician noted that Claimant requires use of a cane. It was noted that Claimant required household assistance with heavy chores.

Typically, disability based on joint dysfunction should be supported with radiology. Claimant presented no supportive radiology. Instead, Claimant presented a physician statement that did not even list a diagnosis for hip problems. Claimant has ongoing insurance; presumably, Claimant could obtain radiology through the insurance. Despite the lack of diagnosis and radiology, Claimant's physician provided some support for stated work restrictions.

A positive Patrick's test was noted; this is known to be consistent with hip joint dysfunction. Lifting and ambulation restrictions are consistent with a positive Patrick's test. Comparable work restrictions were also noted in a disability examination. It is found that Claimant has basic work restrictions which have lasted 12 months or longer.

As it was found that Claimant established significant impairment to basic work activities for a period longer than 12 months, it is found that Claimant established having a severe impairment. Accordingly, the disability analysis may move 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.

Claimant's most prominent impairment appears to be left hip dysfunction. Claimant's impairment is covered by Listing 1.02 which reads as follows:

- 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint(s) (due to any cause):** Characterized by gross anatomical deformity (e.g., subluxation, contracture, bony or fibrous ankylosis, instability) and chronic joint pain and stiffness with signs of limitation of motion or other abnormal motion of the affected joint(s), and findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging of joint space narrowing, bony destruction, or ankylosis of the affected joint(s). With:
- A. Involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b;
- OR
- B. Involvement of one major peripheral joint in each upper extremity (i.e., shoulder, elbow, or wrist-hand), resulting in inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively, as defined in 1.00B2c.

As indicated above, the ability to ambulate effectively is defined by SSA in 1.00B2b. This definition reads:

Inability to ambulate effectively means an extreme limitation of the ability to walk; i.e., an impairment(s) that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. Ineffective ambulation is defined generally as having insufficient lower extremity functioning (see 1.00J) to permit independent ambulation without the use of a hand-held assistive device(s) that limits the functioning of both upper extremities.

Claimant's physician noted that Claimant's left hip was tender and had severe decreased range of motion. The statements are consistent with an inability to ambulate effectively.

Claimant's physician also indicated that Claimant could not stand/walk 2 hours in 8-hour workday or sit 6 hours of an 8-hour workday. An inability to stand, sit or walk a combined 8 hours in a workday makes it improbable that Claimant could perform any employment. The restrictions are consistent with finding that Claimant is unable to ambulate effectively.

A SSA physician found that Claimant could stand or sit for 6 hours in an 8-hour workday. Treating source opinions cannot be discounted unless the Administrative Law Judge provides good reasons for discounting the opinion. *Rogers v. Commissioner*, 486 F. 3d 234 (6th Cir. 2007); *Bowen v Commissioner*. Preference is given to Claimant's treating physician as the treating physician.

Though medically acceptable imaging is technically required by the listing, sufficient alternative evidence was presented. Based on the presented evidence, it is found that Claimant is unable to ambulate effectively due to hip problems. Accordingly, Claimant meets the SSA listing and is a disabled individual.

It should be noted that Claimant is expected to have better ambulation following hip surgery. Claimant estimated that he would need four months of physical therapy following surgery. A more conservative estimate of six months will be granted. Thus, a review of Claimant's disability will be scheduled in six months rather than in the typical one-year period.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program which provides financial assistance for disabled persons is established by 2004 PA 344. DHS administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3151-400.3180. DHS policies for SDA are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

SDA provides financial assistance to disabled adults who are not eligible for Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits. BEM 100 (1/2013), p. 4. The goal of the SDA program is to provide financial assistance to meet a disabled person's basic personal and shelter needs. *Id.* To receive SDA, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person, or age 65 or older. BEM 261 (1/2012), p. 1.

A person is disabled for SDA purposes if he/she:

- receives other specified disability-related benefits or services, see Other Benefits or Services below, or
- resides in a qualified Special Living Arrangement facility, or
- is certified as unable to work due to mental or physical disability for at least 90 days from the onset of the disability; or
- is diagnosed as having Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS).
Id.

It has already been found that Claimant is disabled for purposes of MA benefits based on a finding that Claimant's impairments meet SSA Listing 1.02. The analysis and finding applies equally for Claimant's SDA benefit application. It is found that Claimant is a disabled individual for purposes of SDA eligibility and that DHS improperly denied Claimant's application for SDA benefits.


DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds that DHS improperly denied Claimant's application for MA and SDA benefits. It is ordered that DHS:

- (1) reinstate Claimant's MA benefit application dated [REDACTED]

- (2) evaluate Claimant's eligibility for MA and SDA benefits subject to the finding that Claimant is a disabled individual;
- (3) initiate a supplement for any benefits not issued as a result of the improper application denial; and
- (4) schedule a review of benefits in **six months** from the date of this administrative decision, if Claimant is found eligible for future MA or SDA benefits.

The actions taken by DHS are **REVERSED**.


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

Date Signed: 3/26/2014

Date Mailed: 3/26/2014

NOTICE OF APPEAL: The claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request (60 days for FAP cases).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted 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 Department, AHR or the claimant 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 the hearing decision is mailed.

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

CG/hw

cc:

