



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: August 14, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-004668  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Lain

### **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. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on August 7, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by himself. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department or Respondent) was represented by Stephanie Speckin, Assistance Payments Supervisor.

Respondent's Exhibit A pages 1-440 and Exhibit B pages 1-26 (photographs of Petitioner's skin condition) were admitted as evidence.

### **ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit programs?

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- (1) On [REDACTED], 2018, Petitioner filed an application for SDA benefits alleging disability.
- (2) Petitioner receives MA benefits.
- (3) On April 19, 2018, the Medical Review Team denied Petitioner's application stating that Petitioner could perform other work.
- (4) On April 23, 2018, the Department caseworker sent Petitioner notice that his application was denied.

- (5) On May 9, 2018, Petitioner filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
- (6) On May 21, 2018, the Michigan Administrative Hearing system received the Hearing summary and attached documentation.
- (7) On August 7, 2018, the hearing was held.
- (8) Petitioner is a [REDACTED]-year-old man whose date of birth is [REDACTED], 1979. He is [REDACTED]10" tall and weighs [REDACTED] lbs. He is a graduate of Michigan State University and has a Bachelor of Arts in Communications.
- (9) Petitioner last worked for his mother's interior design business in June of 2018. Petitioner has worked at the [REDACTED] as a sportswriter for ten years, and as a bartender for ten years. Petitioner also works as an official for high school sporting events.
- (10) Petitioner alleges as disabling impairments: Epidermolysis Bullosa (chronic sores, lesions and blisters), liver malfunction, and depression.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

Department policies are contained in the following Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, was established by 2004 PA 344. The Department administers the SDA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 *et seq.* and Mich Admin Code, Rules 400.3151 – 400.3180. A person is considered disabled for SDA purposes if the person has a physical or mental impairment which meets federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) disability standards for at least ninety days. Receipt of SSI benefits based on disability or blindness, or the receipt of MA benefits based on disability or blindness, automatically qualifies an individual as disabled for purposes of the SDA program.

Pursuant to Federal Rule 42 CFR 435.540, the Department of Human Services uses the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) policy in determining eligibility for disability under the Medical Assistance 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

A set order is used to determine disability. Current work activity, severity of impairments, residual functional capacity, past work, age, or education and work experience is reviewed. 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.

If an individual is working and the work is substantial gainful activity, the individual is not disabled regardless of the medical condition, education and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(c).

If the impairment or combination of impairments do not significantly limit physical or mental ability to do basic work activities, it is not a severe impairment(s) and disability does not exist. Age, education and work experience will not be considered. 20 CFR 416.920.

Statements about pain or other symptoms do not alone establish disability. 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 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 clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for a recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities, or ability to reason

and to make appropriate mental adjustments, if a mental disability is being alleged. 20 CFR 416.913.

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).

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).

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).

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).

When determining disability, the federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order. If disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required. These steps are:

1. Does the client perform Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA)? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 2. 20 CFR 416.920(b).
2. Does the client have a severe impairment that has lasted or is expected to last 12 months or more or result in death? If no, the client is ineligible for MA. If yes, the analysis continues to Step 3. 20 CFR 416.920(c).
3. Does the impairment appear on a special listing of impairments or are the client's symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings at least equivalent in severity to the set of medical findings specified for the listed impairment? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.290(d).
4. Can the client do the former work that he/she performed within the last 15 years? If yes, the client is ineligible for MA. If no, the analysis continues to Step 5. 20 CFR 416.920(e).
5. Does the client have the Residual Functional Capacity (RFC) to perform other work according to the guidelines set forth at 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 2, Sections 200.00-204.00? If yes, the analysis ends and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

At Step 1, Petitioner is not engaged in substantial gainful activity and has not worked since August 3, 2016. Petitioner is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

The subjective and objective medical evidence on the record indicates:

Petitioner testified on the record that he lives with his mother and has periodic income of \$1,000.00 per month from her when he can work. He receives Medical Assistance. He has a driver's license and drives daily to the grocery store and to the drug store. He can drive half hour to [REDACTED]. He cooks sandwiches, spaghetti, and food in the slow

cooker. Petitioner grocery shops every two weeks and sometimes needs help. He rides in the amigo cart because he cannot walk much. He dusts, vacuums, and does light cleaning. He can stand for two hours, sit for 4 hours, and walk for ¼ mile. He is able to squat, bend at the waist, shower, and dress himself. He can carry maximum 50 pounds. Petitioner has been eight months sober. Petitioner testifies that he has chronic and consistent blisters and legions. He has scabbing and scarring on his entire body.

This Administrative Law Judge did consider the entire record in making this decision.

Medical documentation indicates a non-severe condition:

An [REDACTED], 2018, Disability Determination Explanation (Exhibit A pages 45-70) indicates, that Petitioner has a lifelong history of Epidermolysis Bullosa (EB). He has a five-inch enlargement of the liver with splenomegaly (March 22, 2018) and ascites present. He had been abstinent from alcohol for four months. He was recently hospitalized for liver failure with liver extremity edema. His blood pressure was 118/64; pulse 82; respiratory rate 12. No masses, no clubbing or cyanosis. Trace edema present, normal pulses. No joint laxity, crepitanace (crepitus) or effusion. Grip and dexterity unimpaired. No difficulties getting on or off the table. Range of motion was essentially normal. Strength and tone intact. Sensation intact.

The Physical Residual Functional Capacity Assessment indicates that Petitioner can occasionally carry 50 pounds and frequently carries 25 pounds. He can walk, sit or stand 6 hours, in an 8-hour day. Petitioner does not have postural, manipulative, visual, communicative or environmental limitations. There is insufficient evidence that Petitioner's EB has more than a minimal effect on Petitioner's ability to function and is therefore not severe. The record does not show any examination findings which would support significant functional limitations were in as Petitioner would not be able to sustain medium work. The medical evidence in the file does not establish a condition that meets or equals a listing. Petitioner can perform medium work and is not disabled pursuant to medical vocational rule 203.28. Substance abuse is documented but a drug and alcohol abuse material determination is not required.

An [REDACTED], 2018, medical note indicates that petitioner skin problems only appeared and January 2018, so it doesn't meet duration. Please review rationale as to why the Doctor thinks alcohol is what exacerbated his underlying chronic EB simplex. (Exhibit A Page 183)

A [REDACTED], 2018 medical examination report indicates that Petitioner is [REDACTED]' [REDACTED]" tall and weighed [REDACTED] pounds. His blood pressure was 109/59. He was assessed with leg swelling, a blister on his leg, alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver with ascites and Barrett's esophagus without dysplasia. (Exhibit A Page 190)

On [REDACTED] 2018, petitioner had an upper GI endoscopy. (Exhibit A Page 250)  
A February 22, 2018, medical examination report indicates that Petitioner was positive for abdominal tension/abdominal pain and negative for jaundice. Petitioner was

malnourished and had no acute distress/well developed. He had normal respiratory, normal auscultation. He had edema in his extremities. He was assessed with the alcoholic cirrhosis of the liver. (Exhibit A Page 196)

A [REDACTED], 2018 letter from [REDACTED] indicates that Petitioner has joined alcoholics anonymous, goes daily, and has sponsors. He used to consume 10 alcoholic beverages daily for the past two years. Prior to that he was consuming 6 to 8 beverages a day for eight years. He started developing leg swelling and ascites in January of 2018. He needs AGI D with banding now. He had jaundice at that time of the mission and feels it is improving. He has some muscle weakness, changes of skin color and wounds on his abdomen. He has intermittent confusion and depression as well as agitation. (Exhibit A Page 232)

On [REDACTED], 2018, petitioner underwent an endoscopic gastroduodenoscopy with variceal band ligation – Petitioner bleeding from gastric cardia varices and esophageal varices present as well. (Exhibit A Page 242)

A December 4, 2017 medical examination report indicates that Petitioner was assessed with Epidermolysis bullosa and depression. (Exhibit A Page 216)

In October 22, 1017 medical examination report indicates that petitioner was in no acute distress. He was well developed. He had hepatic enlargement. He was oriented to time, place and person in situation. He had appropriate mood and affect. His behavior was appropriate for his age. (Exhibit A Page 224)

At Step 2, Petitioner has the burden of proof of establishing that he has a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last for the duration of at least 12 months. There is insufficient objective clinical medical evidence in the record that Petitioner suffers a severely restrictive physical or mental impairment.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has reports of pain in multiple areas of his body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by Petitioner. There are no laboratory or x-ray findings listed in the file. The clinical impression is that Petitioner is stable. There is no medical finding that Petitioner has any muscle atrophy or trauma, abnormality or injury that is consistent with a deteriorating condition. In short, Petitioner has restricted himself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon his reports of pain (symptoms) rather than medical findings. Reported symptoms are an insufficient basis upon which a finding that Petitioner has met the evidentiary burden of proof can be made. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the medical record is insufficient to establish that Petitioner has a severely restrictive physical impairment.

Petitioner alleges the following disabling mental impairments: depression, related to alcoholism.

A [REDACTED], 2017, community mental health individual therapy service note indicates that Petitioner was smoking cannabis almost every day. He was supposed to start shots for alcohol cravings. He was oriented times three his motor activity, speech than thoughts are unremarkable. (Pages 285-286)

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).

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence in the record indicating Petitioner suffers severe mental limitations. There is no mental residual functional capacity assessment in the record, but Petitioner was oriented x3 at all psychiatric evaluations. There is insufficient evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Petitioner from working at any job. Petitioner was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Petitioner was able to answer all of the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. The evidentiary record is insufficient to find that Petitioner suffers a severely restrictive mental impairment. For these reasons, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner has failed to meet his burden of proof at Step 2. Petitioner must be denied benefits at this step based upon his failure to meet the evidentiary burden.

If Petitioner had not been denied at Step 2, the analysis would proceed to Step 3 where the medical evidence of Petitioner's condition does not give rise to a finding that he would meet a statutory listing in the code of federal regulations.

If Petitioner had not already been denied at Step 2, this Administrative Law Judge would have to deny him again at Step 4 based upon his ability to perform his past relevant work. There is no evidence upon which this Administrative Law Judge could base a finding that Petitioner is unable to perform work in which he has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if Petitioner had not already been denied at Step 2, he would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior jobs.

At Step 5, the burden of proof shifts to the Department to establish that Petitioner does not have residual functional capacity.

The residual functional capacity is what an individual can do despite limitations. All impairments will be considered in addition to ability to meet certain demands of jobs in the national economy. Physical demands, mental demands, sensory requirements and other functions will be evaluated. 20 CFR 416.945(a).



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.

**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).

Petitioner has submitted insufficient objective medical evidence that he lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in his prior employment or that he is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of him. Petitioner's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and he should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Petitioner has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that he has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent him from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. Petitioner's testimony as to his limitations indicates that he should be able to perform light or sedentary work. Thus, he retains the capacity to perform prior work and he is found not disabled at Step 4.

There is insufficient objective medical/psychiatric evidence contained in the file of depression or a cognitive dysfunction that is so severe that it would prevent Petitioner from working at any job. Petitioner was able to answer all the questions at the hearing and was responsive to the questions. Petitioner was oriented to time, person and place during the hearing. Petitioner's complaints of pain, while profound and credible, are out of proportion to the objective medical evidence contained in the file as it relates to Petitioner's ability to perform work. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the objective medical evidence on the record does not establish that Petitioner has no residual functional capacity. Petitioner is disqualified from receiving disability at Step 5 based upon the fact that he has not established by objective medical evidence that he cannot perform light or sedentary work even with his impairments. Under the Medical-Vocational guidelines, a person closely approaching advanced age (age ■■■), high school education and an unskilled work history who is limited to light work is not considered disabled.

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.

When the record contains evidence of DAA, a determination must be made whether or not the person would continue to be disabled if the individual stopped using drugs or alcohol. The trier of fact must determine what, if any, of the physical or mental limitations would remain if the person were to stop the use of the drugs or alcohol and whether any of these remaining limitations would be disabling.

Petitioner's testimony and the information indicate that Petitioner has a history of tobacco, drug, or alcohol abuse. Applicable herein is the Drug Abuse and Alcohol (DA&A) Legislation, Public Law 104-121, Section 105(b)(1), 110 STAT. 853, 42 USC 423(d)(2)(C), 1382(c)(a)(3)(J) Supplement Five 1999. The law indicates that individuals are not eligible and/or are not disabled where drug addiction or alcoholism is a contributing factor material to the determination of disability. After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner does not meet the statutory disability definition under the authority of the DA&A Legislation because his substance abuse is material to his alleged impairment and alleged disability.

Careful consideration has been given to Petitioner's allegations and symptoms. Petitioner has established that his physical and mental condition could cause problems with daily and work functioning. However, the totality of the evidence does not support total disability. Petitioner's medically determinable impairments could reasonably be expected to produce alleged symptoms, but Petitioner's statements concerning the intensity, persistence and limiting effects of these symptoms are not entirely credible when compared to the limitations suggested by the objective medical evidence contained in the file.

The Department's Program 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. Because Petitioner does not meet the definition of disabled under the MA based upon disability and because the evidence of record does not establish that Petitioner is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, Petitioner does not meet the disability criteria for State Disability Assistance benefits.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with department policy when it determined that Petitioner was not eligible to receive State Disability Assistance based upon disability.

**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 was acting in compliance with department policy when it denied Petitioner's application for State Disability Assistance benefits. Petitioner should be able to perform a wide range of light or sedentary work even with his impairments. The Department has established its case by a preponderance of the evidence.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED** based upon the substantive information contained in the file.

LL/bb



---

**Landis Lain**  
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) 763-0155; 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**

Erin Bancroft  
105 W. Tolles Drive  
St. Johns, MI 48879

Clinton County, DHHS

BSC2 via electronic mail

L. Karadsheh via electronic mail

B. Cabanaw via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]