



**Date Mailed:** August 22, 2025

**Docket No.:** 25-022721

**Case No.:** [REDACTED]

**Petitioner:** [REDACTED]

This is an important legal document. Please have someone translate the document.

هذه وثيقة قانونية مهمة. يرجى أن يكون هناك شخص ما يترجم المستند.

এটি একটি গুরুত্বপূর্ণ আইনি ডকুমেন্ট। দয়া করে কেউ দস্তাবেজ অনুবাদ করুন।

Este es un documento legal importante. Por favor, que alguien traduzca el documento.

这是一份重要的法律文件。请让别人翻译文件。

Ky është një dokument ligjor i rëndësishëm. Ju lutem, kini dikë ta përktheni dokumentin.

**Date Mailed:** August 22, 2025

**Docket No.:** 25-022721

**Case No.:** [REDACTED]

**Petitioner:** [REDACTED]

### **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 July 24, 2025, from Lansing, Michigan. The Petitioner was represented by himself. The Department was represented by Amanda Boobyer. Department Exhibit 1, pp. 1-1752 was received and admitted.

### **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 or around October [REDACTED] 2024, Petitioner submitted an application seeking cash assistance benefits on the basis of a disability.
2. On or around May [REDACTED] 2025, the Disability Determination Service (DDS) found Petitioner not disabled for purposes of the SDA program. (Exhibit A, pp. 38-39)
3. On or around May [REDACTED] 2025, the Department sent Petitioner a Notice of Case Action, denying his SDA application based on DDS' finding that she was not disabled. (Exhibit A, pp. 55-58)
4. On or around June [REDACTED] 2025, Petitioner submitted a timely written Request for Hearing disputing the Department's denial of his SDA application. (Exhibit A, pp. 3-5)
5. In connection with the application, Petitioner completed a Medical Social Questionnaire, on which he alleged disabling impairments head injury, neck injury collar bone injury, right arm injury, hyperlipidemia, sleep apnea and glaucoma. Petitioner also has mental impairments including schizophrenia, anxiety, depression, panic disorder, antisocial personality disorder and PTSD.

- 
6. As of the hearing date, Petitioner was ■ years old with a February ■ 1976, date of birth. He was ■ and weighed ■ pounds.
  7. Petitioner's highest level of education is a 10<sup>th</sup> grade and a GED. Petitioner has employment history of work as a laborer and factory worker. Petitioner was last employed in 2017. Petitioner worked as a cleaner in prison working 1 hour per week.
  8. Petitioner has a pending disability claim with the Social Security Administration (SSA).
  9. Petitioner testified that he sees a psychiatrist and a therapist.
  10. Petitioner testified that he is not able to do household chores or mow the lawn.
  11. Petitioner testified that he is able to lift up to 7 pounds, he is able to stand for 4 minutes per day, sit 60 minutes per day, and walk one block without stopping.
  12. At the time of hearing, Petitioner was taking Cymbalta, Geodon, Artane, Xanax, and Lipitor.
  13. Petitioner testified that he experiences pain at a high level of 9 on an every day basis.
  14. Petitioner testified that he attempted suicide 3 times.
  15. Petitioner has memory and concentration problems.
  16. An x-ray of Petitioner's cervical spine on April 29, 2025, showed degenerative disc disease at C5-C6. (Ex. 1, p.217)

### **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 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.

Petitioner applied for cash assistance alleging a disability. A disabled person is eligible for SDA. BEM 261 (April 2017), p. 1. An individual automatically qualifies as disabled for

25-022721

---

purposes of the SDA program if the individual receives Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Medical Assistance (MA-P) benefits based on disability or blindness. BEM 261, p. 2. Otherwise, to be considered disabled for SDA purposes, a person must have a physical or mental impairment for at least ninety days which meets federal SSI disability standards, meaning the person is unable to do any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment. BEM 261, pp. 1-2; 20 CFR 416.901; 20 CFR 416.905(a).

Determining whether an individual is disabled for SSI purposes requires the application of a five step evaluation of whether the individual (1) is engaged in substantial gainful activity (SGA); (2) has an impairment that is severe; (3) has an impairment and duration that meet or equal a listed impairment in Appendix 1 Subpart P of 20 CFR 404; (4) has the residual functional capacity to perform past relevant work; and (5) has the residual functional capacity and vocational factors (based on age, education and work experience) to adjust to other work. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(1) and (4); 20 CFR 416.945. If an individual is found disabled, or not disabled, at any step in this process, a determination or decision is made with no need to evaluate subsequent steps. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4). If a determination cannot be made that an individual is disabled, or not disabled at a particular step, the next step is required. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4).

In general, the individual has the responsibility to establish a disability through the use of competent medical evidence from qualified medical sources such as his or her medical history, clinical/laboratory findings, diagnosis/prescribed treatment, prognosis for recovery and/or medical assessment of ability to do work-related activities or, if a mental disability is alleged, to reason and make appropriate mental adjustments. 20 CFR 416.912(a); 20 CFR 416.913. An individual's subjective pain complaints are not, in and of themselves, sufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.908; 20 CFR 416.929(a). Similarly, conclusory statements by a physician or mental health professional that an individual is disabled or blind, absent supporting medical evidence, are insufficient to establish disability. 20 CFR 416.927(d).

### **Step One**

The first step in determining whether an individual is disabled requires consideration of the individual's current work activity. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(i). If an individual is working and the work is SGA, then the individual must be considered not disabled, regardless of medical condition, age, education, or work experience. 20 CFR 416.920(b); 20 CFR 416.971. SGA means work that involves doing significant and productive physical or mental duties and that is done, or intended to be done, for pay or profit. 20 CFR 416.972.

In this case, Petitioner was not working during the period for which assistance might be available. Because Petitioner was not engaged in SGA, she is not ineligible under Step 1, and the analysis continues to Step 2.

---

## **Step Two**

Under Step 2, the severity and duration of an individual's alleged impairment is considered. If the individual does not have a severe medically determinable physical or mental impairment (or a combination of impairments) that meets the duration requirement, the individual is not disabled. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii). The duration requirement for SDA means that the impairment is expected to result in death or has lasted, or is expected to last, for a continuous period of at least 90 days. 20 CFR 416.922; BEM 261, p. 2.

An impairment, or combination of impairments, is severe if it significantly limits an individual's physical or mental ability to do basic work activities. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(ii); 20 CFR 416.920(c). Basic work activities mean the abilities and aptitudes necessary to do most jobs, such as (i) physical functions such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling; (ii) the capacity to see, hear, and speak; (iii) the ability to understand, carry out, and remember simple instructions; (iv) use of judgment; (v) responding appropriately to supervision, co-workers and usual work situations; and (vi) dealing with changes in a routine work setting. 20 CFR 416.922(b). A claim may be denied at Step 2 only if the evidence shows that the individual's impairments, when considered in combination, do not have more than a minimal effect on the person's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Social Security Ruling (SSR) 85-28.

The individual bears the burden to present sufficient objective medical evidence to substantiate the alleged disabling impairments. While the Step 2 severity requirement may be employed as an administrative convenience to screen out claims that are totally groundless solely from a medical standpoint, under the de minimis standard applied at Step 2, an impairment is severe unless it is only a slight abnormality that minimally affects work ability regardless of age, education and experience. *Higgs v Bowen*, 880 F2d 860, 862-863 (CA 6, 1988), citing *Farris v Sec of Health and Human Services*, 773 F2d 85, 90 n.1 (CA 6, 1985). A claim may be denied at Step 2 only if the evidence shows that the individual's impairments, when considered in combination, are not medically severe, i.e., do not have more than a minimal effect on the person's physical or mental ability to perform basic work activities. Social Security Ruling (SSR) 85-28.

The medical evidence presented at the hearing was thoroughly reviewed.

In this case, the Petitioner's medical evidence of record supports a finding that Petitioner has significant physical and mental limitations upon Petitioner's ability to perform basic work activities such as walking, standing, sitting, lifting, pushing, pulling, reaching, carrying, or handling. Medical evidence has clearly established that the Petitioner has an impairment (or combination of impairments) that has more than a minimal effect on the Petitioner's work activities. See Social Security Rulings: 85-28, 88-13, and 82-63.

---

In the third step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine if the Petitioner's impairment (or combination of impairments) is listed in Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR, Part 404. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Petitioner's medical record does not support a finding that the Petitioner's impairment(s) is a "listed impairment" or equal to a listed impairment. See Appendix 1 of Subpart P of 20 CFR Part 404, Part A. Listings 12.04, 12.06 and 1.18 were considered.

Petitioner's RFC is considered at both Steps 4 and 5. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4), (f) and (g).

#### **Step Four**

Step 4 in analyzing a disability claim requires an assessment of Petitioner's RFC and past relevant employment. 20 CFR 416.920(a)(4)(iv). Past relevant work is work that has been performed by Petitioner (as actually performed by Petitioner or as generally performed in the national economy) within the past 5 years that was SGA and that lasted long enough for the individual to learn the position. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1)(i). Work that was started and stopped in fewer than 30 calendar days is not PRW. *Id.* and 20 CFR 416.960(b)(1)(ii). An individual who has the RFC to meet the physical and mental demands of work done in the past is not disabled. *Id.*; 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3); 20 CFR 416.920. Vocational factors of age, education, and work experience, and whether the past relevant employment exists in significant numbers in the national economy are **not** considered. 20 CFR 416.960(b)(3).

Petitioner's work history in the 5 years prior to the application consists of work as a laborer and factory worker. Petitioner's work as a factory worker, which required standing for more than 4 hours per day and lifting up to 50 pounds regularly, required medium physical exertion.

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. A conclusory statement by a physician, or mental health professional, that an individual is disabled, or blind, is not sufficient without supporting medical evidence to establish disability...20 CFR 416.927.

Based on the RFC analysis above, Petitioner's exertional RFC limits him to no more than light work activities. As such, Petitioner is incapable of performing past relevant work. Petitioner also has significant limitations in his mental capacity to perform basic work activities. In light of the entire record, it is found that petitioner's nonexertional RFC prohibits him from performing past relevant work.

Because Petitioner is unable to perform past relevant work, Petitioner cannot be found disabled, or not disabled, at Step 4, and the assessment continues to Step 5. The

---

Petitioner's impairments would prevent her from doing past relevant work. This Administrative Law Judge will continue through step 5.

---

In the final step of the analysis, the trier of fact must determine: if the Petitioner's impairment(s) prevent the Petitioner from doing other work, 20 CFR 416.920(f). This determination is based upon the Petitioner's:

1. residual functional capacity defined simply as "what can you still do despite your limitations? 20 CFR 416.945;
2. age, education, and work experience, 20 CFR 416.963-965; and
3. the kinds of work which exist in significant numbers in the national economy which the Petitioner could perform despite her limitations, 20 CFR 416.966.

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).

**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).

---

See *Felton v DSS* 161 Mich. App 690, 696 (1987). Once the Petitioner makes it to the final step of the analysis, the Petitioner has already established a prima facie case of disability. *Richardson v Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 732 Fd2 962 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir, 1984).

Moving forward the burden of proof rests with the State to prove by substantial evidence that the Petitioner has the residual function capacity for substantial gainful activity. After careful review of Petitioner's extensive medical record, and the Administrative Law Judge's personal interaction with Petitioner at the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Petitioner's exertional and non-exertional impairments render Petitioner unable to engage in a full range of, even sedentary, work activities on a regular and continuing basis. 20 CFR 404, Subpart P, Appendix 11, Section 201.00(h). See Social Security Ruling 83-10; *Wilson v Heckler*, 743 F2d 216 (1986).

The Department has failed to provide vocational evidence which establishes that Petitioner has the residual functional capacity for substantial gainful activity and, that given Petitioner's age, education, and work experience, there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy which the Petitioner could perform despite Petitioner's limitations.

Accordingly, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that Petitioner is disabled for purposes of the SDA program as of October 1, 2024. Petitioner's testimony regarding his limitations and ability to sit, stand, walk, lift, and carry is credible and supported by substantial medical evidence. Petitioner also has psychological impairments that are substantially limiting.

Therefore, Petitioner is found to be disabled.



---

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Petitioner is medically disabled as of October 1, 2024.

---

Accordingly, the Department's decision is hereby **REVERSED** and the Department is ORDERED to INITIATE THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate a review of the application for SDA dated October 1, 2024, if not done previously, to determine Petitioner's non-medical eligibility.
2. The Department shall inform Petitioner of the determination in writing. A review of this case shall be set for August 2026.



---

**AARON MCCLINTIC**  
**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**

**APPEAL RIGHTS:** Petitioner may appeal this Hearing Decision to the circuit court. Rules for appeals to the circuit court can be found in the Michigan Court Rules (MCR), including MCR 7.101 to MCR 7.123, available at the Michigan Courts website at [courts.michigan.gov](https://courts.michigan.gov). The Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR) cannot provide legal advice, but assistance may be available through the State Bar of Michigan at <https://lrs.michbar.org> or Michigan Legal Help at <https://michiganlegalhelp.org>. A copy of the circuit court appeal should be sent to MOAHR. A circuit court appeal may result in a reversal of the Hearing Decision.

Either party who disagrees with this Hearing Decision may also send a written request for a rehearing and/or reconsideration to MOAHR within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision. The request should include Petitioner's name, the docket number from page 1 of this Hearing Decision, an explanation of the specific reasons for the request, and any documents supporting the request. The request should be sent to MOAHR

- by email to [MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov](mailto:MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov), **OR**
- by fax at (517) 763-0155, **OR**
- by mail addressed to  
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules  
Rehearing/Reconsideration Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing Michigan 48909-8139

Documents sent via email are not secure and can be faxed or mailed to avoid any potential risks. Requests MOAHR receives more than 30 days from the mailing date of this Hearing Decision may be considered untimely and dismissed.

**Via Electronic Mail:**

**Respondent**  
CALHOUN COUNTY DHHS  
190 E MICHIGAN AVE  
PO BOX 490  
BATTLE CREEK, MI 49016  
**MDHHS-CALHOUN-  
HEARINGS@MICHIGAN.GOV**

**Via First Class Mail:**

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]