



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: June 30, 2021  
MOAHR Docket No.: 21-002107  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice Spodarek**

**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, an administrative hearing was held on June 15, 2021.

Petitioner personally appeared and testified. [REDACTED] Petitioner's son-in-law, appeared as a representative.

Respondent was represented by Connie Aymen, ES worker.

Department Exhibit A.664 was offered and admitted into the record.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) program.

**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 [REDACTED] 2021 Petitioner applied for SDA, a cash benefit program based on disability, with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.
2. There is no issue regarding medical.
3. MRT denied Petitioner's application and on April 7, 2021 the Department issued notice.
4. On April 28, 2021 Petitioner filed a hearing request.

5. Petitioner has had two social security applications denied when she was residing in Tennessee in 2016. In [REDACTED] 2020 Petitioner applied for social security while residing in Michigan. Petitioner represents that her application is pending.
6. As of the date of application, Petitioner was a [REDACTED] year-old, standing [REDACTED] tall and weighing [REDACTED] pounds. Petitioner's Body Mass Index (BMI) is [REDACTED], classifying Petitioner as [REDACTED] under the BMI.
7. Petitioner has no alcohol/drug abuse problem and history which Petitioner testifies is in remission.
8. Petitioner does not have a driver's license but reported that she had one ticket she did not pay and her driver's license was revoked.
9. Petitioner has a GED.
10. MRT indicates alleged impairments bipolar, anxiety, auditory hallucinations, neuropathy, osteoarthritis, sciatic pain, migraines, back pain, breast mass. Petitioner testified that she alleges disability based on her mental impairments only but testified as to physical issues affecting her.
11. Petitioner had an unfavorable federal social security ALJ decision on May 17, 2016. MRT finds that due to a listing change the entire decision cannot be adopted but did not find any significant medical or functional changes that would change the outcome and analysis of the federal 2016 SSA decision.
12. MRT adopted the federal social security ALJ decision of June 30, 2019 indicating that Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform a full range of motion. "No physical MER is provided that would limit decision rendered by the ALJ." Exhibit A.21.
13. Petitioner is not currently working. Petitioner's work history is unskilled.
14. MRT denied due to Petitioner not meeting duration requirements BEM 261, and based on 20 CFR 416.920(f) medical vocation grid rule 202.20. The MRT findings and conclusions are adopted and incorporated by reference herein. That conclusion finds that the claimant's statements are partially consistent—while severe and persistent, the effect is not fully supported to prevent Petitioner from performing and sustaining light work activities. Denied pursuant to 20 CFR 416.920 and grid 202.14.
15. The law classifies Petitioner at [REDACTED] years old as a [REDACTED] for disability purposes.
16. Petitioner is able to fix food, do light housework, and laundry. Petitioner does not need any assistance with her bathroom and grooming needs.
17. Petitioner does not exercise.

## 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), and Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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, 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.

For the SDA program, 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.

As to the disability assessment, the State of Michigan follows the general guidelines with regards to the MA program to show SDA statutory disability with one major exception: duration for the SDA program is due to a disability which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 90 days. Unless otherwise noted below, the MA regulations, policy and law are followed.

Relevant federal guidelines provide in pertinent part:

Disability is:

...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.

Federal regulations require that several considerations be analyzed in sequential order:

We follow a set order to determine whether you are disabled. We review any current work activity, the severity of your impairment(s), your residual functional capacity, your past work, and your age, education and work experience. If we can find that you are disabled or not disabled at any point in the review, we do not review your claim further.... 20 CFR 416.920.

The regulations require that if disability can be ruled out at any step, analysis of the next step is not required.

These steps are:

1. If you are working and the work you are doing is substantial gainful activity, we will find that you are not disabled regardless of your medical condition or your age, education, and work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b). Monthly income limit for 2017 presumptive SGA for non-blind individuals is \$1,170.00. If the applicant is not engaged SGA or presumptive SGA, the analysis continues to Step 2.
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 416.909(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 that meets the duration requirement? If no, the analysis continues to Step 4. If yes, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(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. Sections 200.00-204.00(f).
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? This step considers the residual functional capacity, age, education, and past work experience to see if the client can do other work. If yes, the analysis ends, and the client is ineligible for MA. If no, MA is approved. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

At application, Petitioner has the burden of proof:

...You must provide medical evidence showing that you have an impairment(s) and how severe it is during the time you say that you are disabled. 20 CFR 416.912(c).

Federal regulations are very specific regarding the type of medical evidence required to establish statutory disability. Statements alone made by the applicant and/or the applicant's physician are not sufficient. Rather, regulations require laboratory or clinical medical reports that corroborate an any applicant's or physicians' statements regarding disability. These regulations state in part:

...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 sure, X-rays);
- (4) Diagnosis (statement of disease or injury based on its signs and symptoms) ... 20 CFR 416.913(b).

...Statements about your pain or other symptoms will not alone establish that you are disabled; there must be medical signs and laboratory findings which show that you have a medical impairment.... 20 CFR 416.929(a).

...The medical evidence...must be complete and detailed enough to allow us to make a determination about whether you are disabled or blind. 20 CFR 416.913(d).

Medical findings consist of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings:

- (a) **Symptoms** are your own description of your physical or mental impairment. Your statements alone are not enough to establish that there is a physical or mental impairment.
- (b) **Signs** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which can be observed, apart from your statements (symptoms). Signs must be shown by medically acceptable clinical diagnostic techniques.
- (c) **Psychiatric signs** are medically demonstrable phenomena which indicate specific psychological abnormalities e.g., abnormalities of behavior, mood, thought, memory, orientation, development, or perception. They must also be shown by

observable facts that can be medically described and evaluated;

- (d) **Laboratory findings** are anatomical, physiological, or psychological phenomena which can be shown by the use of a medically acceptable laboratory diagnostic techniques. Some of these diagnostic techniques include chemical tests, electrophysiological studies (electrocardiogram, electroencephalogram, etc.), roentgenological studies (X-rays), and psychological tests. 20 CFR 416.928.

It must allow us to determine --

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

Information from other sources may also help us to understand how your impairment(s) affects your ability to work. 20 CFR 416.913(e).

...You can only be found disabled if you are unable 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. See 20 CFR 416.905. Your impairment must result from anatomical, physiological, or psychological abnormalities which are demonstrable by medically acceptable clinical and laboratory diagnostic techniques.... 20 CFR 416.927.

It is noted that Congress removed obesity from the Listing of Impairments shortly after the removal of drug and alcohol addiction. This removal reflects the view of a strong behavioral component. In addition, these behavioral driven impairments are not considered to fall within the category of diseases under consideration of statutory disability under the social security disability program.

Applying the sequential analysis herein, Petitioner is not ineligible at the first step as Petitioner is not currently working. 20 CFR 416.920(b). The analysis continues.

The second step of the analysis looks at a two-fold assessment of duration and severity. 20 CFR 416.920(c). This second step is a de minimis standard. Ruling any ambiguities in Petitioner's favor, this Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that Petitioner meets both. The analysis continues.

The third step of the analysis looks at whether an individual meet or equals one of the Listings of Impairments. 20 CFR 416.920(d). Petitioner does not. The analysis continues.

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 Petitioner in the past. 20 CFR 416.920(f).

In this case, Petitioner testified that she only alleges mental impairments. Based on Petitioner's representations, the medical evidence taken as a whole supports finding that Petitioner is found not disabled on the basis that Petitioner can return to past relevant work at Step 4 of the analysis, which is also consistent with the MRT conclusions. However, as Petitioner also has multiple references in her medical file, as well as references Petitioner made to her physical issues at the administrative hearing, the analysis will continue to Step 5 with regard to Petitioner's physical impairments.

The fifth and final step of the analysis applies the biographical data of the applicant to the Medical Vocational Grids to determine the residual functional capacity of the applicant to do other work. 20 CFR 416.920(g).

After a careful review of the credible and substantial evidence on the whole record, this Administrative Law Judge concurs with the MRT in finding that the medical vocational grids require a finding of not disabled pursuant to medical vocational grid rule 202.20. In reaching this conclusion, it is noted that the law classifies Petitioner as a [REDACTED] as Petitioner is only [REDACTED] years old. At [REDACTED] the bar for statutory disability is very high.

In reaching this conclusion it is noted that Petitioner's obesity, and by analogy smoking as discussed below, are the "individual responsibility" types of behaviors reflected in the *SIAS v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 861 F2d 475 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1988) decision. In *Sias*, the Petitioner was an obese, heavy smoker who argued that he could not afford support hose prescribed by his doctor for acute thrombophlebitis. The doctor also advised Petitioner to reduce his body weight. The court said in part:

...The Petitioner's style of life is not consistent with that of a person who suffers from intractable pain or who believes his condition could develop into a very quick life-threatening situation. The Petitioner admitted to the ALJ he was at least 40 pounds overweight; ignoring the instructions of his physician, he has not lost weight.

...The Social Security Act did not repeal the principle of individual responsibility. Each of us faces myriads of choices in life, and the choices we make, whether we like it or not, have consequences. If the Petitioner in this case chooses to drive himself to an early grave, that is his privilege—but if he is not truly disabled, he has no right to require those who pay Social Security taxes to help underwrite the cost of his ride. *Sias*, supra, p. 481.

In *Sias*, the Petitioner was found not truly disabled because the secretary disregarded the consequences resulting from the Petitioner's unhealthy habits and lifestyles—including the failure to stop smoking. *Awad v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 734 F2d 288, 289-90 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1984).

Statutory disability does not recognize many behaviors as statutorily disabling where behavioral driven treatment will remove or reduce the severity or complaint. Among others, this includes complaints such as drug and alcohol addiction, obesity, and *smoking. Issues related to these problems often result from life style choices.* In addition, many heart problems, type 2 diabetes, neuropathy, and high cholesterol have been significantly correlated with many life style behaviors. In such instances, the symptoms and problem are treatable--obesity is treatable with weight loss, diet and exercise; alcoholism and drug addiction with abstinence; lung/breathing related medical issues are treatable with cessation from smoking. As with the congressional mandate denying statutory disability for alcohol and drug addiction, individual behaviors that drive medically related complaints and symptoms are not considered under the federal social security law as "truly disabling". See *Sias, supra*. In most instances, standard medical protocol is to instruct the individual to stop consuming alcohol, stop the drug addiction, stop smoking, and to lose weight. In fact, 20 CFR 416.930 requires a finding of not disabled where an individual fails to follow the recommended or prescribed treatment program.

Here, Petitioner is [REDACTED] under the BMI calculator. Using the same analysis required under the drug and alcohol legislation enacted by congress, as well as the Congressional removal of the [REDACTED] criteria from the Listings of Impairments, Petitioner did not meet the burden to show that if the nicotine addiction and [REDACTED] behaviors were removed that the medical would still show with substantial and credible evidence statutory disability as defined under federal and state law. Petitioner could not identify any exhibits in the medical packet as medical evidence to support a claim of disability due to the inability to work.

At the administrative hearing Petitioner's representative attacked the credibility of the report signed by Dr. Chiambretti, D.O. with MRT on the grounds that Petitioner was never examined by Dr. Chiambretti. However, the Department did not present any evidence that indicates that it is claiming that this physician personally examined Petitioner in any way. The federal and state MRT collaboration for federal social security claims and state SDA assessments require that the MRT conducts a paper review of the entire medical evidence. In this case, the MRT assessment complies with the federal and state mandates.

Petitioner does have medically determinable impairments that would reasonably cause some of the alleged symptoms. However, the intensity, persistence, or alleged functionally limiting effects of pain or other symptoms are not altogether substantiated by objective medical evidence.

At the administrative hearing Petitioner and her representative did not seem to be familiar with the medical evidence that the Department collected on Petitioner's behalf for application. Petitioner was given a full copy of the evidentiary packet and given



sufficient time to prepare for the hearing. Petitioner has the burden of proof. Petitioner failed to bring forth credible and substantial evidence to establish statutory disability as defined under federal and state law and policy.

It is noted that Petitioner's conditions result in some limitations on her ability to perform work related activities. However, the evidence does not support that Petitioner's conditions are severe enough to keep her from working. While Petitioner may not be able to return to past relevant work, based on the evidence of record, the medical vocational grid requires a finding that Petitioner can adjust to other work in the alternative.

Petitioner's complaint of symptoms is not recognized as statutorily disabling absent corroboration requirements pursuant to 20 CFR 416.929. Claimant further failed to meet the burden of proof required by 20 CFR 416.912(c) and further as required by the sufficiency requirements found at 20 CFR 416.913(b), and .913(d), and .913(e).

Petitioner's complaints and descriptions of symptoms are not consistent with the great weight of the objective medical evidence pursuant to the requirements found at 20 CFR 416.9139(b), .913(d), and .913(e).


The purview of an administrative law judge is to review the Department's actions and to make a determination if that action is consistent with the evidence of record. Here Petitioner failed to bring forth sufficient evidence to support her claim that the MRT denial is not supported by the evidence of record. As such, the undersigned is required by federal and state law to uphold the denial.

Based on the record established in this matter and the applicable law, and for the reasons set forth herein, statutory disability is not shown, and thus, the Department's denial must be upheld.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

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

JS/ml

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Janice Spodarek**  
Administrative Law Judge

**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 Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR 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. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

**DHHS – via electronic mail**

Huron County DHHS  
BSC2  
L. Karadsheh

**Petitioner – via first class mail**

██████████  
██████████  
██████, MI ██████████