


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-29320
Issue No.: 2009
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 25, 2014
County: Van Buren

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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, a three-way telephone hearing was held on June 25, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Hassan Abraham (Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) from L&S Associates and [REDACTED] (Claimant). Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] (Family Independence Manager) and [REDACTED] (Eligibility Specialist).

During the hearing, Claimant waived the time period for the issuance of this decision, in order to allow for the submission of additional medical records. The evidence was received, reviewed, and forwarded to the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT) for consideration. On August 7, 2014, the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) received the SHRT determination which found Claimant was not disabled. This matter is now before the undersigned for a final decision.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA-P) and Retro MA?

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 September 26, 2013, Claimant filed an application for MA-P and Retro MA-P benefits alleging disability.

2. On December 5, 2013, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application.
3. On December 6, 2013, the Department caseworker sent Claimant notice that her application was denied.
4. On February 21, 2014, Claimant filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's action.
5. On May 5, 2014, the State Hearing Review Team (SHRT), following a review of additional records, again denied Claimant's application.
6. A telephone hearing was held on June 25, 2014. During the hearing, the Administrative Law Judge held the record open to allow for Claimant's additional records to be submitted. Claimant consented and agreed to waive the time periods.
7. The additional records were received and forwarded to the SHRT.
8. On August 5, 2014, the SHRT again denied Claimant's application.
9. Claimant has alleged the following disabling impairments: liver disease, hepatic failure, cirrhosis, and alcohol addiction/abuse.
10. At the time of the hearing, Claimant was 48 (forty-eight) years old with a birth date of [REDACTED]; stood 5'2"; and weighed approximately 145 (one-hundred and forty-five) pounds (lbs).
11. Claimant has a GED with sporadic employment history as a gas station/convenience store cashier or clerk, food preparation at a grocery store delicatessen and worked as a lab technician conducting testing at a juice company.
12. Claimant has an addiction to alcohol and has been drinking on and off since she was 16 years old.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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 MA program. Under SSI, 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

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. Claimant's impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. A physical or mental impairment must be established by medical evidence consisting of signs, symptoms, and laboratory findings, not only the claimant's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the claimant has impairment and the nature and extent of its severity. 20 CFR 416.912. Information must be sufficient to enable a determination as to the nature and limiting effects of the impairment for the period in question, the probable duration of the impairment and the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913.

Medical findings must allow a determination of (1) the nature and limiting effects of your impairment(s) for any period in question; (2) the probable duration of the impairment; and (3) the residual functional capacity to do work-related physical and mental activities. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical evidence may contain medical opinions. Medical opinions are statements from physicians and psychologists or other acceptable medical sources that reflect judgments about the nature and severity of the impairment(s), including your symptoms, diagnosis and prognosis, what an individual can do despite impairment(s), and the physical or mental restrictions. 20 CFR 416.927(a)(2).

All of the evidence relevant to the claim, including medical opinions, is reviewed and findings are made. 20 CFR 416.927(c). A statement by a medical source finding that an individual is "disabled" or "unable to work" does not mean that disability exists for the purposes of the program. 20 CFR 416.927(e). Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. 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. There must be medical signs and laboratory findings which demonstrate a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...Medical reports should include –

- (1) Medical history.
- (2) Clinical findings (such as the results of physical or mental status examinations);
- (3) Laboratory findings (such as blood pressure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms).... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

The law does not require an applicant to be completely symptom free before a finding of lack of disability can be rendered. In fact, if an applicant's symptoms can be managed to the point where substantial gainful activity can be achieved, a finding of not disabled must be rendered.

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).

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 there is a finding that an individual is disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, there will be no further evaluation. 20 CFR 416.920.

At step one, the Administrative Law Judge must determine 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 or she 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 or she is not disabled regardless of how severe his or her physical or mental impairments are and regardless of his or her age, education, and work experience. If the individual is not engaging in SGA, the analysis proceeds to the second step.

At step two, the Administrative Law Judge must determine 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; Social Security Rulings (SSRs) 85-28, 96-3p, and 96-4p). If the claimant does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he or she is not disabled.

For mental disorders, severity is assessed in terms of the functional limitations imposed by the impairment. Functional limitations are assessed using the criteria in paragraph (B) of the listings for mental disorders (descriptions of restrictions of activities of daily living, social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and ability to tolerate increased mental demands associated with competitive work).... 20 CFR, Part 404, Subpart P, App. 1, 12.00(C). First, an individual’s pertinent symptoms, signs and laboratory findings are evaluated to determine whether a medically determinable mental impairment exists. 20 CFR 416.920a(b)(1). When a medically determinable mental impairment is established, the symptoms, signs and laboratory findings that substantiate the impairment are documented to include the individual’s significant history, laboratory findings, and functional limitations. 20 CFR 416.920a(e)(2). Functional limitations are assessed based upon the extent to which the impairment(s) interferes with an individual’s ability to function independently, appropriately, effectively and on a sustained basis. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(2). Chronic mental disorders, structured settings, medication and other treatment, and the effect on the overall degree of functionality are considered. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(1). In addition, four broad functional areas (activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence or pace; and episodes of decompensation) are considered when determining and individual’s degree of functional limitation. 20 CFR 416.920a(c)(4).

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). 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 determining disability under the law, the ability to work is measured. An individual’s functional capacity for doing basic work activities is evaluated. If an individual has the ability to perform basic work activities without significant limitations, he or she is not considered disabled. 20 CFR 416.994(b)(1)(iv).

Basic work activities are the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs. Examples of these 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. 20 CFR 416.921(b).

At step three, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or medically equals 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 meets or medically equals 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.

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, the Administrative Law Judge must first determine the claimant's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(e)). An individual's residual functional capacity is his/her ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from his/her impairments. In making this finding, all of the claimant's impairments, including impairments that are not severe, must be considered (20 CFR 404.1520(e), 404.1545, 416.920(e), and 416.945; SSR 96-8p).

Next, the Administrative Law Judge must determine at step four whether the claimant has the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his or her 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 (fifteen) years or 15 (fifteen) 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 or her 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.

At the last step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g), the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the claimant is able to do any other work considering his or her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. If the claimant is able to do other work, he or she is not disabled. If the claimant is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirements, he or she is disabled.

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. The terms are defined as follows:

Sedentary work. Sedentary work involves lifting no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. Although a sedentary job is defined as one which involves sitting, a certain amount of walking and standing is often necessary in carrying out job duties. Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met. 20 CFR 416.967(a).

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).

Medium work. Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. If someone can do medium work, we determine that he or she can also do sedentary and light work. 20 CFR 416.967(c).

Heavy work. Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. If someone can do heavy work, we determine that he or she can also do medium, light, and sedentary work. 20 CFR 416.967(d).

The analysis begins at Step 1. To be eligible for disability benefits, a person must be unable to engage in substantial gainful activity (SGA). Claimant is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since August, 2013. Therefore, Claimant is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1 and the analysis proceeds to Step 2.

At Step 2, Claimant's symptoms are evaluated to see if there is an underlying medically determinable physical or mental impairment(s) that could reasonably be expected to

produce Claimant's pain or other symptoms. This must be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. Once an underlying physical or mental impairment(s) has been shown, the Administrative Law Judge must evaluate the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of Claimant's symptoms to determine the extent to which they limit Claimant's ability to do basic work activities. For this purpose, whenever statements about the intensity, persistence, or functionally limiting effects of pain or other symptoms are not substantiated by objective medical evidence, a finding on the credibility of the statements based on a consideration of the entire case record must be made.

In the present case, Claimant alleges disability due to liver disease, hepatic failure, cirrhosis, and alcohol addiction/abuse. The following is a summary of Claimant's medical records in this matter.

Claimant's medical records confirm that she has "alcoholic liver disease," advanced cirrhosis with portal hypertension, splenomegaly and pancytopenia. She also has coagulopathy and hypoalbuminemia. The records indicated that Claimant was a smoker.

In September, 2013, Claimant visited the hospital after she fell in the bathtub and stated that she had a headache ever since. The hospital record indicated that Claimant was an alcoholic with multiple other medical issues. She was diagnosed with an intraparenchymal hemorrhage, but did not require surgery. Claimant's hospital admission records, dated September 8, 2013, showed an admission for possible hepatic failure. These records indicated that Claimant had "alcoholic liver disease and cirrhosis with portal hypertension, splenomegaly. Pancytopenia, low albumin and coagulopathy who continues to drink." Apparently, Claimant fell and developed pain and swelling in her left ankle area. Her x-rays and venous studies were negative.

On [REDACTED], Claimant visited the emergency room complaining of a sudden onset of nausea and abdominal pain in the right lower quadrant. Her physical examination failed to reveal any neurological deficits or hemodynamic instability. Her urinalysis showed that she had a urinary tract infection (UTI). She was given Keflex, Ultram and Zofran at discharge. Respondent was not admitted.

The objective medical evidence shows that Claimant has a medically determinable impairment that is "severe" for purposes of Step 2. The objective medical evidence shows that Claimant has alcoholic liver disease as well as advanced cirrhosis with portal hypertension, splenomegaly and pancytopenia. Claimant has presented medical evidence that demonstrates she has some physical and/or mental limitations on her ability to perform basic work activities. The medical evidence has established that Claimant has an impairment, or combination of impairments, that has more than a *de minimus* effect on her basic work activities. Further, the impairments have lasted continuously for 12 (twelve) months; therefore, Claimant is not disqualified from receiving MA-P benefits at Step 2.

The analysis proceeds to Step 3 where the medical evidence of Claimant's condition is compared to the listings. In the third step of the sequential analysis of a disability claim, the trier of fact must determine if Claimant's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404.

Claimant's AHR contends that she meets or equals the following listings: 5.05A and B(2)(a) (chronic liver disease) based on her international normalized ratio (INR) and Albumin levels as evidenced by Exhibit 3, pp. 42, 76-78. Claimant's AHR did not identify any other listings during the hearing.

The following listings were considered in light of the objective evidence: 5.05 (chronic liver disease) and 12.09 (substance addiction disorders). Listing 5.05 requires chronic liver disease with:

- A. Hemorrhaging from esophageal, gastric, or ectopic varices or from portal hypertensive gastropathy, demonstrated by endoscopy, x-ray, or other appropriate medically acceptable imaging, resulting in hemodynamic instability as defined in 5.00D5, and requiring hospitalization for transfusion of at least 2 units of blood. Consider under disability for 1 year following the last documented transfusion; thereafter, evaluate the residual impairment(s).

OR

- B. Ascites or hydrothorax not attributable to other causes, despite continuing treatment as prescribed, present on at least 2 evaluations at least 60 days apart within a consecutive 6-month period. Each evaluation must be documented by:
 - 1. Paracentesis or thoracentesis; or
 - 2. Appropriate medically acceptable imaging or physical examination and one of the following:
 - a. Serum albumin of 3.0 g/dL or less; or
 - b. International Normalized Ratio (INR) of at least 1.5.

Based on the above objective medical evidence, Claimant does not meet or equal the requirements of listing 5.05A. With regard to 5.05B, Bronson laboratory records showed that Claimant's albumin level was 3.2 (See Exhibit 1, p 77 and Exhibit 3, p 42). But the listing requires a Serum albumin level of 3.0 g/dl or less. Although Claimant's albumin level was low within the range of 3.5-5.0 g/dl, it did not meet the 3.0 or less requirement set forth in 5.05B(2)(a). Moreover, the objective medical records did not demonstrate that Claimant had an INR of at least 1.5. Accordingly, Claimant does not meet either listing 5.05A or 5.05B.

12.09 Substance addiction disorders: Behavioral changes or physical changes associated with the regular use of substances that affect the central nervous system.

The required level of severity for these disorders is met when the requirements in any of the following (A through I) are satisfied.

A. Organic mental disorders. Evaluate under 12.02.

B. Depressive syndrome. Evaluate under 12.04.

C. Anxiety disorders. Evaluate under 12.06.

D. Personality disorders. Evaluate under 12.08.

E. Peripheral neuropathies. Evaluate under 11.14.

F. Liver damage. Evaluate under 5.05.

G. Gastritis. Evaluate under 5.00.

H. Pancreatitis. Evaluate under 5.08.

I. Seizures. Evaluate under 11.02 or 11.03.

Here, the objective medical evidence shows that Claimant has an addiction to alcohol which has caused liver damage. However, 12.09 specifically requires under subsection F that if liver damage is present, it must be evaluated under 5.05. Here, the above analysis confirms that Claimant does not meet or equal the requirements of 5.05. Thus, Claimant does not meet the requisite level of severity to meet listing 12.09 for her substance abuse disorder. Accordingly, Claimant does not meet, or equal, a listing and cannot be found disabled at Step 3.

Before Step 4, the Administrative Law Judge must determine Claimant's residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of her past relevant work. Here, the central question is whether Claimant has the ability to do physical and mental work activities on a sustained basis despite limitations from her impairments. Claimant contends that she is unable to work due to fatigue and the physical inability to remain focused on task. She claims that she requires several naps each day. However, Claimant's statements concerning the intensity, persistence and limiting effects of these symptoms are not credible to the extent they are inconsistent with the objective medical records.

The fourth step of the analysis to be considered is whether the Claimant has the ability to perform work previously performed by the Claimant within the past 15 years. The

trier of fact must determine whether the impairment presented prevent the Claimant from doing past relevant work. In the present case, the Claimant's most recent employment was as a clerk. Working as a cashier/clerk, as described by Claimant at hearing, would be considered light work because she was required to lift no more than 20 lbs. This is considered unskilled work. Claimant testified that she can do the following activities: walk short distances (about 1 city block and back) without assistance; grip/grasp items; sit; lift/carry 10-15 pounds; stand for short periods with limitations due to fatigue; and can freely bend and squat. The objective findings do not show any physician imposed limitations. After review of the entire record to include Claimant's credible testimony, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Claimant is able to maintain the physical and mental demands necessary to perform limited light work as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(a).

There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that Claimant is unable to perform her past relevant work. Because Claimant is able to engage in work which she has performed in the past, she is denied from receiving disability at Step 4.

At Step 5, this Administrative Law Judge must determine whether or not Claimant has the residual functional capacity to do any other work in the national economy considering his or her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. At this point, the burden of proof shifts to the Department. The entire record shows that Claimant is capable of light work. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record fails to show that Claimant has no residual functional capacity. Consequently, Claimant is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light work even with her impairments.

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. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a younger individual (age 48), with a high school education or the equivalent (GED) and an unskilled work history that is transferrable who is capable of light work is not considered disabled pursuant to Vocational Rule 202.20.

Claimant has not satisfied the burden of proof to show by competent, material and substantial evidence that she has an impairment or combination of impairments which would significantly limit the physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(c). Although Claimant has cited medical problems, the objective clinical documentation submitted by Claimant is not sufficient to establish a finding that the claimant is disabled. There is no objective medical evidence to substantiate Claimant's assertion that her alleged impairment is severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disability. Claimant is not disabled for the purposes of the Medical Assistance disability (MA-P) program.

The Federal Regulations at 20 CFR 404.1535 speak to the determination of whether Drug Addiction and Alcoholism (DAA) is material to a person's disability and when benefits will or will not be approved. The regulations require the disability analysis be completed prior to a determination of whether a person's drug and alcohol use is material. **It is only when a person meets the disability criterion, as set forth in the regulations, that the issue of materiality becomes relevant.** In such cases, the regulations require a sixth step to determine the materiality of DAA to a person's disability. Although Claimant's substance abuse (alcohol) is well-documented in this case, the DAA material determination analysis is not required.


The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it acted in compliance with Department policy when it determined that Claimant was not eligible to receive MA-P and/or Retro MA-P.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department has appropriately established on the record that it acted in compliance with Department policy when it denied Claimant's application for MA-P and Retro MA-P.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.



C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 08/28/2014

Date Mailed: 08/28/2014

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

CAP/sw

cc:

