

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



MAHS Reg. No.: 15-016793
Issue No.: 2009; 4009
Agency Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: December 17, 2015
County: Saginaw

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki Armstrong

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; and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on December 17, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Claimant personally appeared and testified. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department) was represented by Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA) and State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

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 June 25, 2015, Claimant filed an application for MA/Retro-MA and SDA benefits alleging disability.
2. On September 1, 2015, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Claimant's application for MA-P/Retro-MA, indicating Claimant could perform other work. SDA was denied for lack of duration. (Dept Ex. A, p 6).
3. On September 3, 2015, the Department mailed Claimant a Notice of Case Action notifying him that his application for MA and SDA had been denied. (Hearing Summary, Dept Ex. A, p 1A).
4. Department's Exhibit A, pages 1-73 are the medical records of Claimant submitted by the Department to the Medical Review Team. (Dept Ex. A, pp 1-73).

5. On September 24, 2015, Claimant submitted a request for hearing to contest the Department's negative action. (Dept Ex. A, p 1B).
6. Claimant has a history of nerve damage to his left hand, arm, shoulder and neck from a motorcycle accident in 2005. He has also been diagnosed with anxiety and depression. (Testimony).
7. On September 16, 2014, Claimant underwent an electromyogram revealing chronic reinnervation changes of left C6 myotome. No active denervation changes from radiculopathy were seen. The chronic changes appeared to explain his clinical symptom of sensory dysesthesias of the left thumb region related to a chronic C6 nerve root irritation but without any active denervation problem. (Dept Ex. A, p 17).
8. On December 4, 2014, Claimant saw his neurosurgeon. Claimant was referred for problems with neck pain and numbness in his left arm and hand. X-rays of the cervical spine demonstrated moderate changes with significant disc space narrowing and associated foraminal stenosis worse at C5-C6 and C6-C7 levels. The neurosurgeon indicated Claimant has been receiving therapeutic narcotics for some time and his symptoms were not improving. Claimant also described progressive weakness of his left upper extremity. On examination, Claimant had decreased range of motion of his neck and associated cervical spasm. He had weakness of the supinator and grip of the hand with a C6 sensory change. His reflexes in his lower extremities were absent. Claimant was referred for an MRI. (Dept Ex. A, pp 12-13).
9. An MRI of the cervical spine without contrast dated December 11, 2014, revealed tiny broad-based protrusions and bilateral unconvertrebral joint hypertrophy resulting in mild to moderate spinal canal and moderate bilateral neuroforaminal stenosis. Also additional multifocal mild spinal canal and neuroforaminal stenosis in C3-C4, C4-C5, C5-C6 and C6-C7 were observed. (Dept Ex. A, p 14).
10. On April 29, 2015, Claimant saw his treating physician regarding his neck pain. His problem list included scrotal abscess, spermatocele, testicular cyst, neck pain, cervical radiculopathy, left arm pain and narrowing of intervertebral disc space. He was prescribed hydrocodone-acetaminophen and morphine and referred for an EMG NCV arms. (Dept Ex. A, pp 9-11).
11. On July 23, 2015, Claimant underwent a nerve conduction study which was found to be abnormal. There was electrodiagnostic evidence of remote left C7 radiculopathy with no signs of active denervation. Clinically, Claimant's symptoms were consistent with mechanical neck pain with intermittent radicular symptoms. (Dept Ex. A, pp 15-16).
12. Claimant is a [REDACTED] man with a date of birth of [REDACTED]. He is 5'11 and weighs 180 pounds. He has a high school equivalent education. (Testimony).

13. Claimant had applied for social security benefits at the time of this hearing.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and 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 Department of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b. The Department of Health and Human Services (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers the SDA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3151-.3180.

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).

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, Appendix 1, 12.00(C).

As outlined above, the first step looks at the individual's current work activity. In the record presented, Claimant has not worked since June, 2012. 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 anxiety, depression and nerve damage in his left hand, arm, shoulder and neck from a motorcycle accident in 2005. As previously noted, Claimant bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairment(s). Claimant has presented some limited medical evidence of mild to moderate bilateral neuroforaminal stenosis 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.

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. Claimant has alleged physical disabling impairments due to nerve damage on the left side affecting his left arm, hand, shoulder and neck.

Listing 1.00 (musculoskeletal system) 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 of the analysis looks at the ability of the applicant to return to past relevant work. 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 line worker in manufacturing. 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, the Claimant was [REDACTED] and was, thus, considered to be approaching advanced age for MA-P purposes. Claimant has a high school equivalent 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).

Claimant testified that he cannot walk longer than 2 blocks, and cannot stand more than an hour because his back locks up. He spends his days watching television. He also stated that he is taking morphine for the pain. Claimant testified that he has not tried to lift or carry anything.

A review of the Activities of Daily Living form completed by Claimant shows he does his own laundry once a week and washes dishes every day. He also does his own grocery shopping and fixes his own meals.

In light of the foregoing, it is found that Claimant maintains the residual functional capacity for work activities on a regular and continuing basis which includes the ability to meet the physical and mental demands required to perform at least sedentary work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(a). After review of the entire record using the Medical-Vocational Guidelines [20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix II] as a guide, specifically Rule 201.04, it is found that Claimant is not disabled for purposes of the MA-P program at Step 5.


The Department's Bridges Eligibility Manual contains the following policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding the State Disability Assistance program: to receive State Disability Assistance, a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older. BEM, Item 261, p 1. In this case, Claimant is not disabled, caring for a disabled person and is only 53 years of age. Therefore, Claimant is not eligible for the SDA program.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds Claimant not disabled for purposes of the MA-P and SDA benefit programs.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

The Department's determination is **AFFIRMED**.



Vicki Armstrong
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Mailed: **1/5/2016**

VA/nr

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 copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from 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 48909-8139

cc:

