



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Christopher Seppanen
Executive Director

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: January 3, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-017144
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on December 15, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner appeared and testified on his own behalf. Assistance Payments Worker, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] appeared on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services (Department).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Department offered the following exhibit that was marked and admitted into evidence:

Department's Exhibit No. 1 (pages 1 through 225) is a copy of Medical-Social Eligibility Certification (DHS-49-A), Medical-Social Questionnaire (DHS-49-F), Disability Determination Service records, and Petitioner's medical records.

Petitioner's Exhibit A (pages 226 through 228) is a copy of Petitioner's right shoulder MRI dated July 7, 2016.

The record was closed at the conclusion of the hearing.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Petitioner's application for State Disability Assistance (SDA) based on the finding that he was not disabled?

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 May 23, 2016, the Department received Petitioner's application for SDA benefits alleging disability.
2. On October 3, 2016, the Medical Review Team (MRT) denied Petitioner's application.
3. On October 13, 2016, the Department caseworker sent Petitioner notice that her application was denied.
4. On November 18, 2016, Petitioner filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's action.
5. A telephone hearing was held on December 15, 2016.
6. During the hearing, Petitioner stated that he had the following disabling impairments: right shoulder rotator cuff tear which causes pain in his head and neck due to retraction of the tendon. Petitioner stated that the corrective surgery to repair his shoulder was not successful and that he may require additional procedures (tendon harvest transfer).
7. During the hearing, Petitioner testified that he sought "temporary disability" because no one will hire him in his present condition.
8. At the time of the hearing, Petitioner was 48 (forty-eight) years-old with a birth date of [REDACTED]. Petitioner testified that he was 6 feet 1 inch tall and weighed between 185-190 lbs. Petitioner is left hand dominant.
9. Petitioner has a high school education or the equivalent.
10. Petitioner is not engaged in substantial gainful activity (SGA). Petitioner's past relevant employment is in the area of construction, building maintenance, and as a welder.
11. Petitioner has a semi-skilled work history that is transferrable to other jobs.
12. Petitioner testified that he sustained a serious injury to his right shoulder in 2010. He stated that he had a right rotator cuff tear which required surgery with the insertion of anchors. Petitioner stated that he worked following the surgery until 2015 when his condition deteriorated to the point where he could no longer work.

13. Petitioner's medical records show that he has the following medical conditions and/or treatment based on medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques:
 - a. Petitioner had a complete right rotator cuff tear. [Petitioner's Exhibit A, p. 228].
 - b. The right shoulder MRI taken on [REDACTED], showed an "anterior labral tear at 3 o'clock position with displaced long linear." Petitioner also had "complete full-thickness tears with retraction and muscle belly atrophy of the supraspinatus and infraspinatus tendons and small bowel partial undersurface tear of the distal subscapularis tendon." There was also a "shallow Hill-Sachs deformity without associated marrow edema." [Petitioner's Exhibit A, p. 226; Dept. Exh. 1, pp. 176-177].
 - c. Petitioner was diagnosed with carpal tunnel syndrome. On [REDACTED], Petitioner underwent surgery (release of transverse carpal tunnel ligament). [Dept. Exh. 1, p. 179].
 - d. On [REDACTED], Petitioner underwent a complete medical examination. During the examination, Petitioner had some difficulty performing maneuvers with the right shoulder. He was fearful his shoulder would dislocate. Petitioner had decreased range of motion of the right shoulder. Petitioner was negative for carpal tunnel syndrome on either side. [Dept. Exh. 1, pp. 163-168].
 - e. On [REDACTED], x-rays of Petitioner's left wrist were normal. [Dept. Exh. 1, p. 160]. Petitioner's right shoulder revealed degenerative and rotator cuff repair changes, but no acute fractures. [Dept. Exh. 1, p. 161]. Right knee x-rays showed only minimal degenerative changes. [Dept. Exh. 1, p. 162].
 - f. On [REDACTED], Petitioner drove himself to a psychiatric/psychological examination provided by the Disability Determination Services (DSS). The report did not yield any diagnosis and his prognosis was excellent. [Dept. Exh. 1, p. 162].
14. During the relevant time period, Petitioner had been taking the following medications:
 - a. Flexeril.
 - b. Norco.
 - c. Prilosec.

15. The objective medical records did not contain a written opinion from a licensed health professional that Petitioner is permanently disabled.

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. [Emphasis added].

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. The individual'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 individual's statement of symptoms. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.927. Proof must be in the form of medical evidence showing that the individual 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 the 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 the individual's 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).

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.

See 20 CFR 416.921(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 individual 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 the time of the hearing, Petitioner provided credible testimony that he was unemployed and last worked in 2015. Petitioner is not engaged in SGA. Therefore, Petitioner is not disqualified from receiving disability at step one and the analysis proceeds to step two.

At step two, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the individual 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 person does not have a severe medically determinable impairment or combination of impairments, he or she is not disabled.

At this step, the Administrative Law Judge must also evaluate the individual’s symptoms to see if there is an underlying medically determinable physical or mental impairment that could reasonably be expected to produce pain or other symptoms. This must be shown by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques. Once an underlying physical or mental impairment has been shown, the Administrative Law Judge must evaluate the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of the individual’s symptoms to determine the extent to which they limit his or her 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, Petitioner alleges disability due to right rotator cuff problems. As summarized in the above Findings of Fact, Petitioner has presented objective medical evidence establishing that he does have some limitations on the ability to perform basic work activities. The objective medical records did not contain a written opinion from a licensed health professional that Petitioner is permanently disabled from work. The medical evidence in this record shows that Petitioner may have an impairment, or combination thereof, that has more than a *de minimis* effect on his basic work activities. This does not mean that Petitioner is necessarily disabled. The analysis must continue.

After an individual has shown the presence of an underlying physical or mental impairment, he must also show that the impairment, or impairments, possess the requisite intensity, persistence, and limiting effects such that it would limit his ability to do basic work activities.

At step three, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the individual’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 individual’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 individual is disabled. If it does not, the analysis proceeds to the next step.

In the instant matter, Petitioner had a right shoulder rotator cuff surgery in 2010. Following surgery, Petitioner complained of continued pain and difficulty with range of motion. According to Petitioner, he is a candidate for tendon transfer surgery. Based upon the objective medical evidence, the Administrative Law Judge will consider the following listings: 1.02 Major dysfunction of a joint (due to any cause). This listing (1.02) is “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).” This listing requires that an individual possess either: (a) involvement of one major peripheral weight-bearing joint (i.e., hip, knee, or ankle), resulting in inability to ambulate effectively; 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. According to 1.00c, the “inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively” means “an extreme loss of function of both upper extremities.” This listing further indicates that the individual must have an impairment that interferes very seriously with the individual's ability to independently initiate, sustain, or complete activities. In addition, the listing provides that in order to use their upper extremities effectively, individuals must be capable of sustaining such functions as reaching, pushing, pulling, grasping, and fingering to be able to carry out activities of daily living. Therefore, examples of inability to perform fine and gross movements effectively include, but are not limited to, the inability to prepare a simple meal and feed oneself, the inability to take care of personal hygiene, the inability to sort and handle papers or files, and the inability to place files in a file cabinet at or above waist level.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact, Petitioner's objective medical records shows that he does not meet or medically equals the requirements of a listing. While Petitioner does have range of motion limitations in his right shoulder, it cannot be said that he has “extreme loss of function of **both** upper extremities.” Petitioner possesses functional abilities with his left shoulder and upper extremity. The medical evidence presented in this matter is not sufficient to meet the intent and severity requirements of any listing, or its equivalent.

In addition, the individual must show that he has an impairment, or a combination of impairments, that have lasted continuously for a period of 12 (twelve) months. 20 CFR 416.913(d). Based upon the above Findings of Fact, Petitioner has presented objective medical evidence that demonstrates the presence of physical impairment that meets the duration requirement as it has lasted continuously for 12 (twelve) months. The analysis proceeds to step 4. 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Before considering step four of the sequential evaluation process, the Administrative Law Judge must first determine the individual's residual functional capacity (20 CFR 404.1520(e) and 416.920(e)). An individual's residual functional capacity is his or 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 individual'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).

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).

Here, Petitioner alleges that he is disabled due to right shoulder problems following surgery for a rotator cuff tear. Following a review of all of Petitioner's alleged impairments, coupled with the objective medical evidence, this Administrative Law Judge finds that with the exception of his right shoulder, he does not have other physical or mental impairments and he possesses the ability to use his left upper extremity. Using his left extremity, Petitioner can lift/carry at least 10-20 lbs. He can stand, walk, or sit for a normal work day with no physical limitations. The objective medical records do not show that Petitioner has any mental limitations. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform sedentary work on a sustained basis as defined by 20 CFR 416.967(b) on a non-exertional level with the following limitations: avoid use of right arm.

At step four, the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the individual 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 individual 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 individual 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 individual has the residual functional capacity to do his or her past relevant work, he or she is not disabled. If the individual 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.

In the present case, Petitioner testified that he worked for several years as a welder and for a few years in building maintenance. Working as a welder, as described by Petitioner at the hearing, would be considered heavy work. Based on the above analysis, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner does not have the residual functional capacity to work as a welder. The undersigned also finds that Petitioner would not be able to work in building maintenance, which is medium level work. Therefore, Petitioner does not have the residual functional capacity to perform the requirements of his past relevant work. Accordingly, the analysis proceed to the final step.

At the fifth and final step of the sequential evaluation process (20 CFR 404.1520(g) and 416.920(g)), the Administrative Law Judge must determine whether the individual is able to do **any** other work considering his or her residual functional capacity, age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(4)(v). At this point in the analysis, the burden shifts from the individual applicant to the Department to present proof that the individual 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). If the individual is able to do other work, he or she is not disabled. If the individual is not able to do other work and meets the duration requirements, he or she is disabled.

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

Based upon the above-referenced medical-vocational guidelines, Petitioner (age 48) is considered a younger individual, with a high school education or the equivalent (GED),

a semi-skilled work history that is transferrable to other jobs and is capable of sedentary work, is not considered disabled pursuant to medical-vocational rule 201.22.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has not satisfied the burden of proof to show by competent, material and substantial evidence that he 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). The evidence shows that Petitioner is capable of performing other work. Although Petitioner has cited medical problems, there is insufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate Petitioner's assertion that his alleged impairments are severe enough to reach the criteria and definition of disability.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that Petitioner is not disabled for purposes of the MA program.

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

With regard to Petitioner's request for disability under the SDA program, it should be noted that the Department's BEMs contain policy statements and instructions for caseworkers regarding eligibility for SDA. In order to receive SDA, "a person must be disabled, caring for a disabled person or age 65 or older." BEM, 261 (7-1-2015), p. 1.

A person is disabled for SDA purposes if he or she: (1) receives other specified disability-related benefits or services¹; or (2) resides in a qualified Special Living Arrangement facility; or (3) is certified as unable to work due to mental or physical disability for at least 90 days from the onset of the disability; or (4) is diagnosed as having Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS). BEM 261, pp. 1-2. [Emphasis added].

As indicated in the above analysis, Petitioner does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA program and the evidence of record does not show that Petitioner is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 (ninety) days. In addition, this record does not show that Petitioner has met the requirements under BEM 261. Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner is not disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

¹Retirement, Survivors and Disability Insurance (RSDI) due to disability/blindness, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) due to disability/blindness, Medicaid as blind/disabled based on a disability examiner or MRT determination or hearing decision, or Michigan Rehabilitation Services.

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 Petitioner was not eligible to receive SDA.


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 Petitioner's application for SDA.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

CAP/mc



C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; 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

DHHS

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]