

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



MAHS Reg. No.: 15-019538  
Issue No.: 4009  
Agency Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 6, 2016  
County: Wayne (57)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki**

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Petitioner'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 January 7, 2016, from Detroit, Michigan. Petitioner appeared and was unrepresented. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by [REDACTED], medical contact worker.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether MDHHS properly denied Petitioner's State Disability Assistance (SDA) eligibility for the reason that Petitioner 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 April 16, 2015, Petitioner applied for SDA benefits.
2. Petitioner's only basis for SDA benefits was as a disabled individual.
3. On September 28, 2015, the Medical Review Team (MRT) determined that Petitioner was not a disabled individual (see Exhibit 1; pp. 10-17).
4. On October 6, 2015, MDHHS denied Petitioner's application for SDA benefits and mailed a Notice of Case Action (Exhibit 1; pp. 8-9) informing Petitioner of the denial.

5. On October 16, 2015, Petitioner requested a hearing disputing the denial of SDA benefits (see Exhibit 1; pp. 2-3).
6. As of the date of the administrative hearing, Petitioner was a 37-year-old male.
7. Petitioner has not earned substantial gainful activity since before the first month of benefits sought.
8. Petitioner's highest education year completed was the 12<sup>th</sup> grade (via general equivalency degree).
9. Petitioner has a history of unskilled employment, with no known transferrable job skills.
10. Petitioner alleged disability based on restrictions related to lumbar pain.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

Petitioner's hearing request noted a dispute of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits (see Exhibit 1; p. 2). FIP is a program available to caretakers of minor children and pregnant women. Petitioner testimony conceded that a dispute of SDA benefits, not FIP benefits, was intended. MDHHS was not confused by Petitioner's request was prepared to defend a denial of Petitioner's SDA application denial. It is found that Petitioner intended to dispute her SDA eligibility and the hearing was conducted accordingly.

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.*

There was no evidence that any of the above circumstances apply to Petitioner. Accordingly, Petitioner may not be considered for SDA eligibility without undergoing a medical review process (see BAM 815) which determines whether Petitioner is a disabled individual. *Id.*, p. 3.

Generally, state agencies such as MDHHS 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. SDA differs in that a 90 day period is required to establish disability.

SGA means a person does the following: performs significant duties, does them for a reasonable length of time, and does a job normally done for pay or profit. *Id.*, p. 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 SGA. *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 2016 monthly income limit considered SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,130.00.

Petitioner credibly denied performing any employment since the date of the SDA application; no evidence was submitted to contradict Petitioner's testimony. Based on the presented evidence, it is found that Petitioner is not performing SGA and has not performed SGA since the date of application. Accordingly, the disability analysis may proceed to Step 2.

The second step in the disability evaluation is to determine whether a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment exists to meet the durational 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 petitioners to establish the existence of a severe impairment. *Grogan v. Barnhart*, 399 F.3d 1257, 1263 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); *Hinkle v. Apfel*, 132 F.3d 1349, 1352 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F.2d 860, 862 (6<sup>th</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1987). Social Security Ruling 85-28 has been clarified so that the step two severity requirements are intended "to do no more than screen out groundless claims." *McDonald v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 795 F.2d 1118, 1124 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 Petitioner's impairments amount to a severe impairment, all other relevant evidence may be considered. The analysis will begin with a summary of presented medical documentation.

A MRI report (Exhibit 1; pp. 5-6) dated September 6, 2014, of Petitioner's lumbar spine was presented. It was noted disc/bone material may be abutting the nerve roots at L4 and L5. Moderate-to-severe right-sided facet arthropathy was noted at L5-S1. An impression of mild leftward spinal curvature was noted. Multilevel annular disc bulging, endplate spondylosis, and facet arthropathy was also noted. The various problems were noted to cause mild-to-moderate multilevel neural foraminal narrowing, worst at L4-L5 and L5-S1.

A Medical Examination Report (Exhibit 1; pp. 40-42) dated April 28, 2015, was presented. The form was completed by a family medicine physician with an approximate 3-week history of treating Petitioner. Petitioner's physician listed diagnoses of lumbago, chronic pain, and osteochondrosis of the right leg. An impression was given that Petitioner's condition was stable. It was noted that Petitioner needed assistance with cooking, cleaning, and shopping.

An internal medicine examination report (Exhibit 1; pp. 18-25) dated August 21, 2015, was presented. The report was noted as completed by a consultative physician. Petitioner reported complaints of arthritis, depression, back pain, knee pain, and sleep apnea. Petitioner reported he underwent sleep studies in 2009 and 2015; it was also noted Petitioner denied using a CPAP machine. Petitioner reported zero psychiatric treatment history though he reported symptoms of mood swings, anger, hostility, crying spells, and suicidal ideation. It was noted Petitioner wore a TENS unit. Tandem walk, toe walk, and heel walk were noted as slowly performed. Reduced ranges of motion were noted in Petitioner's lumbar flexion (80°- normal 90°) and bilateral hip forward flexion (50°- normal 100°). It was noted that Petitioner was able to perform all 23 listed work-related activities which included sitting, standing, lifting, carrying, stooping, bending, and reaching, though most were performed with pain. Impressions of arthritis, sleep apnea, and depression were noted.

"Specialty clinic" notes (Exhibit A; pp. 4-5) dated October 12, 2015, were presented. It was noted that Petitioner was treated for knee and back pain.

A physical therapy document (Exhibit A; p. 6) dated November 9, 2015, was presented. A plan of 6-8 weeks of PT was noted.

Petitioner testified he has suffered back pain since he was a teenager. Petitioner testified a cortisone injection from September 2015 did little to alleviate back pain though a sacroiliac joint injection helped more. Petitioner testified he currently attends PT three times per week though previous PT sessions did little to alleviate his pain.

Petitioner alleged disability, in part, is based on sleep apnea. Petitioner testified he currently uses a CPAP machine. Petitioner testified the problem makes him tired.

Petitioner testified he deals with daily lumbar and knee pain. Petitioner testified his back and knee pain limit his ability to ambulate, stand, and lift/carry.

Presented documents verified a history of lumbar and knee treatments. Presented records also verified abnormalities on radiology to Petitioner's lumbar and knees which would reasonably expect to restrict Petitioner's ambulation, standing, and lifting/carrying to some degree.

It is found that Petitioner established significant impairment to basic work activities for a period longer than 90 days. Accordingly, it is found that Petitioner established having a severe impairment and the disability analysis may proceed to Step 3.

The third step of the sequential analysis requires determining whether the Petitioner's impairment, or combination of impairments, is listed in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, appendix 1. 20 CFR 416.920 (a)(4)(iii). If a petitioner's impairments are listed and deemed to meet the durational requirement, then the petitioner is deemed disabled. If the impairment is unlisted or impairments do not meet listing level requirements, then the analysis proceeds to the next step.

Claimant's most prominent impairment appears to be back pain. Spinal disorders are covered by Listing 1.04 which reads:

**1.04 Disorders of the spine** (e.g., herniated nucleus pulposus, spinal arachnoiditis, spinal stenosis, osteoarthritis, degenerative disc disease, facet arthritis, vertebral fracture), resulting in compromise of a nerve root (including the cauda equina) or the spinal cord. With:

A. Evidence of nerve root compression characterized by neuro-anatomic distribution of pain, limitation of motion of the spine, motor loss (atrophy with associated muscle weakness or muscle weakness) accompanied by sensory or reflex loss and, if there is involvement of the lower back, positive straight-leg raising test (sitting and supine);

OR

B. Spinal arachnoiditis, confirmed by an operative note or pathology report of tissue biopsy, or by appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by severe burning or painful dysesthesia, resulting in the need for changes in position or posture more than once every 2 hours;

OR

C. Lumbar spinal stenosis resulting in pseudoclaudication, established by findings on appropriate medically acceptable imaging, manifested by chronic nonradicular pain and weakness, and resulting in inability to ambulate effectively, as defined in 1.00B2b.

Looking at Part C, the inability to ambulate effectively is a requirement. SSA defines this as follows:

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.

A need for a walking-assistance device was denied by Petitioner's physician (see Exhibit 1, p. 41) and a consultative physician (see Exhibit 1, p. 24). Generally a client who has no need for a walking assistance device cannot be stated to ambulate ineffectively.

A listing for joint dysfunction (Listing 1.02) was considered based on Petitioner's complaints of knee pain. The listing was rejected due to a failure to establish that Petitioner is unable to ambulate effectively.

A listing for sleep apnea (Listing 3.10) was considered. The listing was rejected due to a failure to meet the requirements of Listings 3.09 or 12.02.

It is found that Petitioner failed to establish meeting a SSA listing. Accordingly, the analysis moves to the fourth step.

The fourth step in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of the Petitioner's residual functional capacity (RFC) and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). An individual is not disabled if it is determined that a petitioner can perform past relevant work. *Id.*

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 is 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.

Petitioner testified he had multiple jobs working for fast-food restaurants. Petitioner estimated his combined employment at the restaurants amounted to 2 months. The employment is found not to have amounted to SGA.

Petitioner testified he worked full-time as a security guard. Petitioner testified he worked various events at arenas. Petitioner testified he was able to maintain employment because he was allowed to sit down the majority of his work time. Petitioner testified his conditions worsened so that he could no longer perform the employment.

Petitioner's testimony was credible and consistent with presented records. It is found that Petitioner is unable to perform past employment amounting to SGA. Accordingly, the analysis may proceed to the final step.

In the fifth step in the process, the individual's RFC in conjunction with his or her age, education, and work experience, are considered to determine whether the individual can engage in any other substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy. SSR

83-10. 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). To determine the physical demands (i.e. exertional requirements) of work in the national economy, jobs are classified as sedentary, light, medium, heavy, and very heavy. 20 CFR 416.967.

Sedentary work involves lifting of no more than 10 pounds at a time and occasionally lifting or carrying articles like docket files, ledgers, and small tools. 20 CFR 416.967(a). 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. *Id.* Jobs are sedentary if walking and standing are required occasionally and other sedentary criteria are met.

Light work involves lifting no more than 20 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing up to 10 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(b) Even though 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. *Id.* To be considered capable of performing a full or wide range of light work, an individual must have the ability to do substantially all of these activities. *Id.* An individual capable of light work is also capable of sedentary work, unless there are additionally limiting factors such as loss of fine dexterity or inability to sit for long periods of time. *Id.*

Medium work involves lifting no more than 50 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 25 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(c). An individual capable of performing medium work is also capable of light and sedentary work. *Id.*

Heavy work involves lifting no more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying of objects weighing up to 50 pounds. 20 CFR 416.967(d). An individual capable of heavy work is also capable of medium, light, and sedentary work. *Id.*

Finally, very heavy work involves lifting objects weighing more than 100 pounds at a time with frequent lifting or carrying objects weighing 50 pounds or more. 20 CFR 416.967(e). An individual capable of very heavy work is able to perform work under all categories. *Id.*

Limitations or restrictions which affect the ability to meet the demands of jobs other than strength demands are considered non-exertional. 20 CFR 416.969a(a). Examples of non-exertional limitations include difficulty functioning due to nervousness, anxiousness, or depression; difficulty maintaining attention or concentration; difficulty understanding



or remembering detailed instructions; difficulty in seeing or hearing; difficulty tolerating some physical feature(s) of certain work settings (e.g. can't tolerate dust or fumes); or difficulty performing the manipulative or postural functions of some work such as reaching, handling, stooping, climbing, crawling, or crouching. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(1)(i)-(vi) If the impairment(s) and related symptoms, such as pain, only affect the ability to perform the non-exertional aspects of work-related activities, the rules in Appendix 2 do not direct factual conclusions of disabled or not disabled. 20 CFR 416.969a(c)(2)

The determination of whether disability exists is based upon the principles in the appropriate sections of the regulations, giving consideration to the rules for specific case situations in Appendix 2. *Id.* In using the rules of Appendix 2, an individual's circumstances, as indicated by the findings with respect to RFC, age, education, and work experience, is compared to the pertinent rule(s).

Given Petitioner's age, education and employment history a determination of disability is dependent on Petitioner's ability to perform sedentary employment. For sedentary employment, periods of standing or walking should generally total no more than about 2 hours of an 8-hour workday. Social Security Rule 83-10.

Petitioner testified he is restricted to one block of walking before his lower back and knees prevent further ambulation. Petitioner testified the same problems restrict his standing to 20 minutes. Petitioner testified sitting "is the best" and did not specify a restriction. Petitioner testified he is totally precluded from lifting/carrying per his doctor's orders. Petitioner testified he is supposed to use a cane (though as noted above, a need for a cane was not verified).

Petitioner testified he has difficulty with bending and squatting. Petitioner testified he has difficulty with washing his lower body and putting on pants. Petitioner testified his friend helps him with cleaning.

Petitioner testified his back pain shoots across his body. Petitioner testified he takes Norco, Tramadol and Motrin for pain. Petitioner testified his pain has not improved since he began seeing doctors

Generally, Petitioner's testimony was consistent with an inability to perform any employment. The analysis will proceed to determine if Petitioner's testimony was consistent with presented evidence.

Physician statements of restrictions were provided. SSR 96-2p states that if a treating source's medical opinion is well-supported and not inconsistent with the other substantial evidence in the case record, it must be given controlling weight (i.e. it must be adopted). 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 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Bowen v Commissioner*.

On the Medical Examination Report dated April 28, 2015, Petitioner's physician stated Petitioner had restrictions expected to last longer than 90 days. It was noted that Petitioner did not need an assistive device for ambulation. Petitioner's physician opined that Petitioner could not stand and/or walk at least 2 hours in an 8 hour workday. Petitioner's physician opined that Petitioner could sit less than 6 hours in an 8 hour workday, but could not sit about 6 hours. Petitioner was restricted to occasional lifting/carrying of 10 pounds, never 20 pounds or more. Petitioner was restricted from performing repetitive pushing/pulling with both hands/arms. Petitioner's physician cited MRIs of Petitioner's lumbar and right knee as support for the restrictions.

Generally, an inability to sit 6 hours combined with an ability to stand/walk 2 hours is indicative of disability. The basis for this conclusion is that if a client could not perform a combination of standing/walking/sitting for 8 hours, then the client is essentially unemployable on a full-time basis.

Generally, disability based on back pain requires a finding of marked stenosis or marked abnormalities. Marked stenosis was not verified, however, many other problems were.

As summarized in the second step of the analysis, nerve root abutment at L4-L5, moderate-to-severe right-sided facet arthropathy at L5-S1 spinal curvature, and multilevel annular disc bulging, endplate spondylosis, and facet arthropathy were noted. Overall mild-to-moderate multilevel neural foraminal narrowing was also noted.

Petitioner's back problems, by themselves, would not establish disability. As it happened, Petitioner had serious right knee problems which were verified by radiology.

A MRI report (Exhibit 1; pp. 7-8) dated September 6, 2014, of Petitioner's right knee was presented. An impression of possible small peripheral undersurface of the posterior horn and medial meniscus was noted. Infrapatellar tendinosis was noted. Mild narrow stress edema possible caused by old Osgood-Schlatter disease was noted.

Elsewhere in presented documents, osteochondrosis was a noted diagnosis. Osteochondrosis is understood to be an orthopedic disease which interrupts a bone's blood supply. It is also understood to be painful with a potential of causing bone deformities.

It is debatable whether the combined lumbar and right knee problems equate to a conclusion that Petitioner cannot perform sedentary employment. In such cases, deference will be given to statements from the treating physician. Petitioner's physician cited restrictions equating to disability. Given the various problems of Petitioner's lumbar and knees verified by radiology, the physician-provided restrictions are reasonable. The restrictions are also consistent with use of a TENS unit which was verified as used.

It is found that Petitioner is disabled. Accordingly, it is found that MDHHS improperly denied Petitioner's SDA application.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law finds that MDHHS improperly denied Petitioner's application for SDA benefits. It is ordered that MDHHS perform the following actions within 10 days of the date of mailing of this decision:

- (1) reinstate Petitioner's SDA benefit application dated April 16, 2015;
- (2) evaluate Petitioner's eligibility subject to the finding that Petitioner 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 one year from the date of this administrative decision, if Petitioner is found eligible for future benefits.

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



**Christian Gardocki**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **1/25/2016**

Date Mailed: **1/25/2016**

CG/tm

**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:

