



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: February 17, 2022  
MOAHR Docket No.: 21-005936  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Lain**

**AMENDED 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 February 2, 2022, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner [REDACTED] was represented by Petitioner. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department or State or Respondent) was represented by Lindsey Hashmi, Assistance Payments Worker and Juan Amaya, Supervisor.

Respondent's Exhibit pages 1-706 were admitted as evidence.

**ISSUE**

Whether the Department properly determined that Petitioner was not disabled for purposes of the State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefit 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 filed an application for State Disability Assistance (SDA) benefits alleging disability.
- (2) Petitioner receives Medical Assistance (MA) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.
- (3) On June 28, 2021, the Medical Review Team denied Petitioner's application stating that Petitioner could perform prior work.

- (4) On October 28, 2021, the department caseworker sent Petitioner notice that her application was denied.
- (5) On December 13, 2021, Petitioner filed a request for a hearing to contest the Department's negative action.
- (6) On February 2, 2022, the hearing was held.
- (7) Petitioner is a [REDACTED] year-old woman (date of birth [REDACTED] 1968). She is [REDACTED] tall and weighs [REDACTED] lbs. She has a high school diploma.
- (8) She last worked in 2019 as a care giver. She has also worked as a cashier, cash counter for Mervyn's for 16 years.
- (9) Petitioner alleges as disabling impairments: Anxiety, Depression, mood disorder, asthma, sciatica, degenerative disc disease, spondylolisthesis, Diabetes Mellitus, kidney problems, suicide attempt [REDACTED], 2016, and lower back pain.

### **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. Petitioner is not disqualified from receiving disability at Step 1.

Petitioner testified on the record: that she lives in a house. Her house is paid for. She is single with no income. She receives Medical Assistance and Food Assistance benefits. She has a driver's license but no car. She does chores in the kitchen and bathroom, and vacuums. She cooks frozen meals. Petitioner grocery shops with no help needed. Petitioner watches television four hours per day. Petitioner testified that she can stand

for 30 minutes and sit for 30 minutes. Her level of pain on a scale from one to ten is an eight without medication.

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

Specific sampling of the medical documentation indicates a non-severe condition:

A [REDACTED] 2021, progress note indicates: Her DM is being primarily managed through Endocrinology/Jennifer Dykstra, NP. She notes that her fasting sugars have gone down in the interim; previously, they went into the 300s, but more recently, she has been noticing more readings <200, most recently in the 75-160 range. She has increased her Lantus to 70 units, once daily. She has been trying to decrease her sugar intake and stay active around the house, though she notes that exercising is difficult when the weather is too warm. She notes that her brother had an amputation in the interim due to his diabetes, and this has "lit a fire under her" to incentivize change in her life. She has type 2 diabetes mellitus with hyperglycemia, with long-term current use of insulin, hyperlipidemia associated with type 2 diabetes, essential hypertension and diabetic polyneuropathy, with bilateral foot pain and well controlled hypertension. She was given a prescription for Gabapentin for the neuropathy.

Objective:

General: Alert, well-nourished, well-developed, no acute distress.  
Skin: Warm, dry, pink, intact.  
Eye: Pupils are equal, round and reactive to light, normal hearing, normocephalic normal conjunctiva.  
Cardiovascular: Regular rate and rhythm, No murmur, Normal peripheral perfusion, 1+ pitting edema of the bilateral lower extremities, S1, S2, no S3, no S4, no cardiac rub.  
Respiratory: Lungs are clear to auscultation, respirations are non-labored, breath sounds are equal, no wheezing, rales, rhonchi. Symmetrical chest wall expansion.  
Genitourinary: No CVA tenderness, suprapubic pain  
Musculoskeletal: Significant pes planus bilaterally  
Neurologic: Alert and oriented. Mild tingling pain to palpation of the balls of the feet; minimal discomfort upon palpation of the heels.  
Psychiatric: Normal judgment, normal mood and affect (Pages 412-416)

A [REDACTED] 2020, physical examination indicates that Petitioner's blood pressure was 155/118. Her MRI Spine Cervical w/o contrast indicates that it showed mild disc osteophyte complexes and mild central stenosis between C4-5 through C6-7. There were no signs of compression or neural impingements. Petitioner had chronic low back pain without signs of radiculopathy, neurogenic claudication or myelopathic process. (Pages 88-89)

A [REDACTED], 2020, Clinic Note indicates that Petitioner was alert and oriented, in no acute distress. She had a normal physical examination. She had a heart examination which indicated that the left ventricle cavity size is normal. Wall thickness increased. Mild concentric hypertrophy. Estimated ejection fraction 55-60% (grade 1 diastolic dysfunction). No acute thoracic process. (Pages 273-275)

At Step 2, Petitioner has the burden of proof of establishing that she 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 her body; however, there are no corresponding clinical findings that support the reports of symptoms and limitations made by the 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 herself from tasks associated with occupational functioning based upon her 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 and anxiety.

An [REDACTED] 2021, Final Report indicates that Petitioner is diagnosed with anxiety and major depressive disorder. Her insight and judgment were fair. She was a low safety concern. Patient did not endorse any suicidal or homicidal ideations. She denied a plan, attempt or intent. She denied access to lethal weapons. (Pages 360-363)

An [REDACTED], 2021 final Report indicates that Client is doing well. She reports that her mother's birthday was [REDACTED] and, although she did have some tears during the session, it seemed like a much more healthy grieving this year than the previous year. It was also noted that her tearing up was for a somewhat lesser period of time. There was some talk about client visiting her mother's grave. She has never gone to the grave. It was decided that it is time for her to finally let go of her mother. Her mother did request that the client scatter her ashes on the graves of her husband and her parents and a sister. We decided that we will work on getting the client ready to say her final goodbyes in [REDACTED] at the anniversary of her mother's death. Some discussion on client finding the financial resources to stay in her home. Client needs to use at approximately \$2000 that will allow her to apply for state disability and get some income. Overall, the client appears to be in a much healthier grieving process than last year. She was cooperative, had appropriate mood and affect with normal judgment. (Page 367)

A [REDACTED], 2019 Behavioral Health office note indicates that Petitioner is a [REDACTED]-year-old white female, casually dressed and moderately well kempt. Sits crying during virtually the whole interview due to the passing of her mother. Behavior is cooperative with intermittent eye

contact. Speech is coherent and goal-directed with normal pace and tone. Thought content normal without complaint of hallucinations, not observed responding to internal stimuli. Thought processes logical and linear with good insight and judgment. No delusions or paranoia. Affect constricted and tearful, mood sad and crying. No suicidal homicidal thoughts. Orientation X3. (Page 320)

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. 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 her burden of proof at Step 2. Petitioner must be denied benefits at this step based upon her 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 she 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 her again at Step 4 based upon her ability to perform her 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 she has engaged in, in the past. Therefore, if Petitioner had not already been denied at Step 2, she would be denied again at Step 4.

The Administrative Law Judge will continue to proceed through the sequential evaluation process to determine whether or not Petitioner has the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her 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 she lacks the residual functional capacity to perform some other less strenuous tasks than in her prior employment or that she is physically unable to do light or sedentary tasks if demanded of her. Petitioner's activities of daily living do not appear to be very limited and she should be able to perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments. Petitioner has failed to provide the necessary objective medical evidence to establish that she has a severe impairment or combination of impairments which prevent her from performing any level of work for a period of 12 months. The Petitioner's testimony as to her limitations indicates that she should be able to perform light or sedentary work. Thus, she retains the capacity to perform prior work and she 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 she has not established by objective medical evidence that she cannot perform light or sedentary work even with her impairments.

It should be noted that claimant continues to smoke despite the fact that her doctor has told her to quit. Claimant is not in compliance with her treatment program.

If an individual fails to follow prescribed treatment which would be expected to restore their ability to engage in substantial activity without good cause there will not be a finding of disability.... 20 CFR 416.994(b)(4)(iv).

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-P program and because the evidence of record does not establish that Petitioner is unable to work for a period exceeding 90 days, the 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 her 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/ml

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Landis Lain**  
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**

MDHHS-Kalamazoo-Hearings  
BSC3  
L. Karadsheh  
MOAHR

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]