cc: Ms. Suzanne Caligiuri/Division of Quality & Surveillance by scan SAPA File

BOA by scan



Department of Health

KATHY HOCHUL Governor JAMES V. McDONALD, M.D., M.P.H. Acting Commissioner **MEGAN E. BALDWIN**Acting Executive Deputy Commissioner

May 19, 2023

CERTIFIED MAIL/RETURN RECEIPT

c/o The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division 120 W. 106th Street New York, NY 10025

Meg Bondy The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division 120 W. 106th Street New York, NY 10025

RE: In the Matter of ____ – Discharge Appeal

Dear Parties:

Enclosed please find the Decision After Hearing in the above referenced matter. This Decision is final and binding.

The party who did not prevail in this hearing may appeal to the courts pursuant to the provisions of Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules. If the party wishes to appeal this decision it may seek advice from the legal resources available (e.g. their attorney, the County Bar Association, Legal Aid, etc.). Such an appeal must be commenced within four (4) months from the date of this Decision.

Sincerely,

Natalie J. Bordeaux

Chief Administrative Law Judge

Bureau of Adjudication

NJB: nm Enclosure STATE OF NEW YORK : DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

In the Matter of an Appeal, pursuant to 10 NYCRR § 415.3, by

COPY

DECISION

Appellant,

from a determination by

THE NEW JEWISH HOME MANHATTAN DIVISION

Respondent,

to discharge him from a residential health : care facility.

Hearing Before:

Matthew C. Hall

Administrative Law Judge

Held at:

Via WebEx

Hearing Date:

April 12, 2023

Parties:

The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division 120 W. 106th Street New York, NY 10025

By: Meg Bondy

By: Pro Se

JURISDICTION

By notice dated , 2023, The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division (the Facility), a residential care facility subject to Article 28 of the New York Public Health Law, determined to discharge (the Appellant) from the Facility. The Appellant appealed the discharge determination to the New York State Department of Health (the Department) pursuant to 10 New York Codes Rules, and Regulations (NYCRR) § 415.3(i).

HEARING RECORD

ALJ Exhibits: I - Notice of Hearing and Discharge Notice

Facility Exhibits: 1 - Patient Summary

2 - Note from Attending Physician

Facility Witnesses: Meg Bondy - Director of Social Work

Appellant's Exhibits: None

Appellant's Witness: Appellant testified on his own behalf

ISSUES

Has the Facility established that the determination to discharge the Appellant is correct and that its discharge plan is appropriate?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Citations in parentheses refer to testimony (T.) of witnesses and exhibits (Ex.) found persuasive in arriving at a particular finding. Conflicting evidence, if any, was considered and rejected in favor of cited evidence.

- 2. He was originally admitted from Hospital for short term care after falling and Hospital (Ex. 1.)
- 3. By notice dated 2023, the Facility determined to discharge the Appellant on , 2023, because his "health improve(d) sufficiently so that the Resident no longer needs the services of the Facility." (ALJ I.)
- 4. As of the date of this hearing, the Appellant had reached his rehabilitation goals. He was able to ambulate independently without an assistive device and could walk even farther with the assistance of a cane. He was completely independent in all Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) such as toileting, bathing, dressing, grooming and hygiene. He was medically stable and alert and oriented with a BIMS score of 15. (Ex. 1,2; T. Bondy.)

- 5. Pursuant to the 2023 discharge notice, the Facility determined to discharge the Appellant to the Shelter located at 2023 discharge notice, the
- 6. Prior to being admitted to the hospital and then transferred to the Facility, the Appellant was "undomiciled." (Ex. 2, T. Bondy.)
- 7. It is the professional opinion of Appellant's caregivers at the Facility, including the Facility's Attending Physician and Director of Social Work, that discharge to the community, including to a Shelter, is appropriate. (Ex. 1,2; T. Bondy.)
- 8. The Appellant remains at the Facility pending the outcome of this appeal.

APPLICABLE LAW

A residential health care facility (also referred to in the Department of Health Rules and Regulations as a nursing home) is a facility which provides regular nursing, medical, rehabilitative, and professional services to residents who do not require hospitalization. Public Health Law §§ 2801(2)(3); 10 NYCRR § 415.2(k).

A resident may only be discharged pursuant to specific provisions of the Department of Health Rules and Regulations (10 NYCRR 415.3[i][1]).

The Facility alleged that the Resident's discharge is permissible pursuant to 10 NYCRR § 415(i)(1)(i)(a)(2):

The transfer or discharge is appropriate because the resident's health has improved sufficiently so the resident no longer needs the services provided by the Facility.

Under the hearing procedures at Title 1.0 NYCRR \$415.3(i)(2)(iii), the Facility bears the burden to prove a discharge necessary and appropriate. Under the New York State Administrative Procedures Act (SAPA) § 306(1), a decision in an administrative proceeding must be in accordance with substantial evidence. Substantial evidence means such relevant proof as a reasonable mind may accept as adequate to support conclusion or fact; less than preponderance of evidence, but more than mere surmise, conjecture or speculation and constituting a rational basis for decision, Stoker v. Tarantino, 101 A.D.2d 651, 475 N.Y.S.2d 562 (3rd Dept. 1984), appeal dismissed 63 N.Y.2d 649.

DISCUSSION

The Appellant was admitted to the Facility on 2023 for short term care after falling and

At the time of his admission to the Facility, the Appellant including ambulating, required assistance with his ADLs, transferring, and showering. By 2023, however, the abilities significantly improved, and he Appellant' independent in all ADLs. He is able to walk limited distances by himself and is able to ambulate farther with the use of a cane. He has no further need for rehabilitation. It is the opinion of the professionals from all Facility disciplines, including Dr. Imran, the Appellant's attending physician, that the Appellant may be safely discharged from the Facility to the Shelter in New York. (Ex. 1,2; T. Bondy.)

The Appellant no longer needs skilled nursing care.

Accordingly, the Facility has proven that its determination to discharge the Appellant is correct.

As discussed above, prior to his stay in a hospital and his transfer to the Facility, the Appellant previously was "undomiciled." (Ex. 2.; T. Bondy.) The Facility has made efforts to find housing for the Appellant in an assisted living facility (ALF) and has in fact, located an ALF that was willing to accept

him as a resident. However, the Appellant has rejected that option, leaving only an opportunity to be placed in the Shelter. (T. Bondy,

Accordingly, the Facility has proven that its determination to discharge the Appellant to the Shelter is appropriate.

DECISION

The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division has established that the determination to discharge the Appellant is correct and that its discharge plan is appropriate.

The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division is authorized to discharge the Appellant in accordance with the 2023, Discharge Notice.

This Decision may be appealed to a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to Article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR).

DATED: Albany, New York May 19, 2023

Matthew C. Hall

Administrative Law Judge

To:

c/o The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division

120 W. 106th Street

New York, NY 10025

Meg Bondy

The New Jewish Home Manhattan Division

120 W. 106th Street

New York, NY 10025