

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

**INQUIRY INTO THE MONITORING AND ENFORCING
OF CHILD SAFE STANDARDS**



**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE
TAKEN AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 17 APRIL 2019**

SESSION THREE

Members

**Hon Dr Sally Talbot, MLC (Chair)
Mr K.M. O'Donnell, MLA (Deputy Chair)
Hon Donna Faragher, MLC
Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski, MLA**

Hearing commenced at 12.21 pm

Ms JANETTE ALLEN

Acting Deputy Commissioner for Women and Young People, Department of Justice, examined:

Mr MICHAEL HESLINGTON

Superintendent, Banksia Hill Detention Centre, Department of Justice, examined:

Ms KATI KRASZLAN

Acting Commissioner for Victims of Crime, Department of Justice, examined:

The CHAIR: On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you for agreeing to appear today to provide evidence in relation to the Joint Standing Committee on the Commissioner for Children And Young People's inquiry into the monitoring and enforcing of child safe standards. My name is Sally Talbot, and I am the Chair of the committee. I will get my colleagues to introduce themselves.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Hon Donna Faragher; member for East Metro Region.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: Kyran O'Donnell, member for Kalgoorlie.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: Jessica Stojkovski, member for Kingsley.

The Acting Principal Research Officer: Michele Chiasson, acting principal research officer.

The CHAIR: It is important that you understand that any deliberate misleading of this committee may be regarded as a contempt of Parliament. Your evidence is protected by parliamentary privilege; however, this privilege does not apply to anything you might say outside of today's proceedings. Can we start by you introducing yourselves for the record, please.

Ms Kraszlan: My name is Katalin, but I am known as Kati Kraszlan. I am currently the acting Commissioner for Victims of Crime.

Ms Allen: Janette Allen. I am currently the acting Deputy Commissioner for Women and Young People, and I have been in that role for about two weeks. Prior to that, my substantive appointment was as the superintendent of Boronia Pre-release Centre for Women.

Supt Heslington: Michael Heslington. I am the substantive Superintendent of Banksia Hill Detention Centre, of which I was appointed two weeks ago.

The CHAIR: Right.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: Newbies.

The CHAIR: Before we start our questions, do you have any queries about your attendance here today?

Ms Kraszlan: No. I do have an opening statement.

The CHAIR: And would you like to start with an opening statement?

Ms Kraszlan: Yes, thank you. Thank you to the committee for providing the opportunity to appear today to contribute to this important inquiry into independent oversight of children and young people, and the role of the children's commissioner. As a background, the Department of Justice is a large department and incorporates courts and tribunal services, which is the courts' administration; State Administrative Tribunal, supervised release board and prisoners' review board. We also have the Public Trustee, public advocates, the State Solicitor's Office, Parliamentary

Counsel, corporate services, and the largest division is Corrective Services, which includes both custodial and non-custodial divisions as well as our operational services. Service delivery to children and young people occurs through the department's role in operating youth justice services and is dedicated to doing so in accordance with the objectives and principles of the Young Offenders Act. This applies to both court and tribunal services and to Corrective Services. A comprehensive review of the Young Offenders Act was approved by the Minister for Corrective Services on 28 March 2019 and will commence shortly. A review of this act has not been completed since the 1990 statutory review. The review will determine whether the act is achieving its objectives within the context of contemporary trends in youth justice.

Administering youth justice is complex, challenging and requires balancing the requirements of minimising the incidence of juvenile crime, managing young persons who have committed crimes and ensuring just punishment and that the community is safe whilst we are rehabilitating young persons to become responsible citizens. It is the duty of the department when a young person is sentenced to a period of detention to ensure the young person's safety and wellbeing. The department takes this duty seriously. The care and treatment of young people is overseen comprehensively by the Inspector of Custodial Services, whose specific statutory role is to inspect, review and report on the state of prisons, detention centres, court custody centres and lock-ups. Custodial services is unique, with perhaps the exception of mental health inpatient services, in being overseen in this state by a specific statute to bound an independent external oversight body.

In addition to oversight by the inspector, youth justice also has specific oversight by other bodies such as the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the Ombudsman. Whilst all have many distinct roles to play in ensuring oversight, the department agrees with the views of the children's commissioner in his 2017 report that as oversight operates currently there is a degree of overlap and fragmentation. The department also notes that the children's commissioner concluded in his report that as far as youth custody is concerned there is a comprehensive and robust system of oversight for young people in the system. The children's commissioner issued a recommendation for youth justice, however, that oversight could be improved by allowing children and young people to access an independent advocate by monitoring the application of policy and practice and monitoring the outcomes for young people.

The operation of the independent visitors' service, which is established under the Inspector of Custodial Services Act, does provide such a service. Independent visitors are bound by the act to visit and speak to detainees at Banksia Hill once every three months and bring issues to the attention of the service and the inspector. The recommendation that the children's commissioner made in his 2017 report, being recommendation 5, is being considered by the department and by the Department of Premier and Cabinet together with oversight recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse with the intention of delivering integrated, comprehensive and streamlined oversight of child safety. At the same time, the department also has responsibilities delegated under the Australian government ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture regarding national preventive mechanisms, which are designed to inspect places that have detention to ensure compliance with OPCAT. A decision on these national preventive mechanisms has not yet been made.

To conclude our opening statement, the department is dedicated to do what it can to improve child safety in youth justice services and agrees that any duplication and oversight should be minimised. It supports child safe standards being fully implemented across the board and mechanisms to monitor and enforce the standards being coordinated, effective and robust. I am sure, as will be relevant, that staff at Banksia Hill in particular have been proactive in improving child safety standards whilst the key recommendations on child safe standards are being considered.

The CHAIR: Thanks very much. It is good that you have actually specifically addressed recommendation 5, because that was going to be my opening question to you. So thank you for that opening statement. Indeed, the commissioner, as you would know, looked at six areas of service provision, and youth justice does indeed have quite an impressive result with the activities of OICS, and I think it is the commissioner himself who said that it is thanks to OICS that we did not ever have a Don Dale here. That is indeed a tribute to Professor Morgan and his team over the years. However, the commissioner's recommendation actually says that "a robust, comprehensive system of oversight for all children and young people in the youth justice system be established". So he does indeed point to the fact that there are gaps. So can I ask you specifically about the way the system is currently working. You said recommendation 5 has been not exactly deferred, but it has been taken as a job lot with the royal commission recommendations. Presumably, there you are talking about the DPC implementation process?

[12.30 pm]

Ms Kraszlan: Yes.

The CHAIR: What has the department done since, I think it was September 2017, when the commissioner provided that oversight report, particularly in relation to the independent advocate, to support children and young people who are in detention?

Ms Kraszlan: At this point, there is no independent advocate to support children and young people in detention. The independent visitors are available to young people in detention. They are accessible every time they come through for children to talk to and for young people to make comment on services and outcomes within the juvenile detention environment.

The CHAIR: Could you describe any system you have in place for actually monitoring the effectiveness of the existing systems, which you have just outlined? How do you tell whether the support and advocacy you provide for children in the youth justice system is actually effective as far as the child goes?

Ms Kraszlan: I would not, at this point, be able to answer that question in terms of a full evaluation. I can take that on notice and come back with outcomes we may have.

The CHAIR: Yes, although it is a broad question. I was just interested to know which part you want to talk about. Perhaps we will delve into it a little bit more. One of the things the commissioner has noted, both in the oversight report and in his submission to this inquiry, which is a public document, as you would know, is that agencies are very good at complying with their statutory obligations, writing reports and coming up with recommendations, but they are less effective when it comes to ensuring that there are material outcomes for children and young people. Let me specifically ask you: do you have a way at the moment of measuring material outcomes for children and young people?

Ms Kraszlan: Could you define "material outcome"?

The CHAIR: When a child makes a complaint, for example, do they have that complaint listened to? Does the child feel their voice has been heard?

Ms Kraszlan: The view at this point would be that the regular inspections that happen through the Office of the Inspector of Custodial Services and their follow-ups would allow for determination as to whether changes have been listened to. We do not have a follow-up review on our complaints services, which has been identified as something to look at.

The CHAIR: Do you work with the Commissioner for Children and Young People?

Ms Kraszlan: Personally?

The CHAIR: Whatever hat you are wearing —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Is there a relationship between the Department of Justice and the children's commissioner? Are there regular meetings or contact or information sharing—would that help?

Supt Heslington: From my point of view, we have had the commissioner out once for a visit and a look around, but that is the only time that I have seen him.

Ms Kraszlan: In terms of regular meetings between youth justice and the commissioner for young people?

The CHAIR: Yes, between the agencies. The commissioner has a statutory brief to listen to the voices of children, and you are a service provider to children. There is a clear overlap in terms of your interests.

Ms Kraszlan: I could come back to you with a list of the regular updates that are happening between the two.

The CHAIR: That would be good. Perhaps we could put the dot points up on the screen. Recognising that there are nine dot points here representing what are known as the Paris principles—they were articulated about 20 years ago in an Australian Law Reform Commission report. Recognising that all these dot points will not be relevant to your agency, is there anything there that you would like to discuss with the committee as far as providing the framework for independent oversight, advocacy, complaints handling and ensuring that you are running child-safe structures or organisations? We did have one agency the other day who came in and said that they had adequate resources, but we have only had one so far.

Ms Kraszlan: I think with regards to the inspector of custodial services, our oversight does have statutory independence from the inspector, who probably has the most comprehensive investigative powers of any inspectorate in Australia and is able to do, as you would be aware, have unannounced inspections as well as announced inspections during their inspection work with young people and children to provide that level of participation. In terms of whether they have adequate resource to do their job, that is a matter for them. They are accessible to all young people within the system. In terms of a relationship, I think that is something that varies from time to time, but the department responds to the inspectorate.

The CHAIR: Perhaps Mr Heslington—should I call you Mr Heslington or Superintendent Heslington?

Supt Heslington: Either will do.

The CHAIR: Superintendent, do you have any comments to make as far as Banksia goes?

Supt Heslington: From Banksia Hill's point of view, we have a very good working relationship with all of the oversight bodies. We have invited them in. They have all been in. They have been for a walk around. They see what we do there. We are regularly in contact with the likes of OICS, the independent visitors and the Ombudsman's office. We work them with when any complaints are made to actually make sure the complaints are taken seriously, they are investigated thoroughly and the responses are done accordingly.

The CHAIR: There was an OICS report a couple of years ago that talked about Banksia Hill. They made a series of recommendations in relation to the children receiving education at the facility. It has been a little unclear to the committee how many of those recommendations have been implemented. Are you able to comment on that? I know you say you have only been there a short time —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Could we just ask one question first up? Can we get some clarity. Is it the Department of Justice that provides education to —

Supt Heslington: Yes.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Thank you. There was previously a lack of clarity around that.

The CHAIR: So you are the provider of the service.

Supt Heslington: Yes.

The CHAIR: Is it funded by Justice?

Supt Heslington: The top three positions are funded by Education and all the other positions funded by Justice.

The CHAIR: How many positions are there?

Supt Heslington: There are 28.4 substantive FTE, but then we also have on top of that casual teachers that come in because when the schoolteachers go on holiday, we picked up that there was nobody doing education during that period. So we have people coming in as casual to do that and we also have students from universities who come in on a voluntary basis as part of their learning and they assist as well.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: You mentioned the top three were paid for by the Department of Education. Can you elaborate as to who the top three are?

Supt Heslington: The principal, the deputy principal and then it will be one of the teachers, I would imagine.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: But the actual delivery of the service all falls within the remit of the Department of Justice?

Supt Heslington: Yes.

The CHAIR: I do not know whether you can see the set of recommendations on the screen. Perhaps we will send them to you and you could take that as a question on notice.

Supt Heslington: Yes, no problem at all.

The CHAIR: If you could give us a status update on each of those 12, that would be very useful for us. Thank you. We will make that a question on notice.

The committee is interested in the whole question about data sharing. It is obviously woven into several reports including the national royal commission. What is your view about the department's capacity to collect data and then to share that information with the appropriate agencies?

Ms Kraszlan: The department has extensive data collection on prisoners and young offenders. The ability to share is limited by the legislation. Obviously, the Department of Communities has some overarching components about sharing in the interests of the child, but the view on data sharing from most officers on the ground is that they will take a conservative approach unless there are clear parameters that allow people to share information. There is no overarching legislation that —

[12.40 pm]

The CHAIR: Are you part of the DPC group looking at modernising data collection and data sharing?

Ms Kraszlan: The department has a representative on that group, but they are not here today.

The CHAIR: The commissioner has said in his submission to this inquiry—I will give you the direct quote because I think it relates to his original recommendation 5 —

... despite the best efforts of the current oversight agencies, where they do operate, there has not been any discernible improvements in quality of care or wellbeing outcomes of these children and young people overall, with many oversight reports repeatedly highlighting the same concerns and recommendations over significant periods of time.

Is that an observation that you would share?

Ms Kraszlan: I have not read all of the reports on Banksia over time to make a comment.

The CHAIR: We are talking specifically about oversight complaints handling. What is your view? How do you monitor it? I think I have come close to this question before. Can you describe for us how a child in Banksia, for example, would make a complaint about treatment or something that was happening to them?

Ms Kraszlan: There would be a number of options for the child. There is a confidential access complaint service that the department operates, which is across all facilities for offenders and prisoners.

The CHAIR: How does that operate in practice?

Ms Kraszlan: It is a “written envelope” process.

Supt Heslington: They do not have to ask for the form; the forms are available. They fill the form in and put them in a confidential envelope. It goes into a box and it is only accessible by two particular staff on site. They do not know who it has come from, but log the fact that they have received an envelope and it is posted to the appropriate place.

The CHAIR: Is that system well used?

Supt Heslington: I could not tell you. I would have to take that on notice and get back to you.

The CHAIR: Would you have the information back in your office?

Supt Heslington: Yes.

The CHAIR: If you could take that on notice, that would be good.

Ms Kraszlan: The second parts are when the Ombudsman comes in, they are able to make a complaint directly on the twice-yearly visits of the Ombudsman —

The CHAIR: How would a child make an appointment to see the Ombudsman for that visit?

Ms Kraszlan: In my experience previously, it was less of an appointment; more that the person walked around and people approached them during that period. That is how independent visitors operate as well. There is not an appointment system; it is more of an informal process whereby they approach the independent visitors. During the course of an inspection, you also have that capacity to approach people during the five days of the inspection rather than make appointments, but you always, during those cases, can make an appointment as well. It is not always formal; sometimes it is informal.

Supt Heslington: The Ombudsman is on that letter as well. There are a whole group of boxes that they can tick for who they want it to go. They can put in a confidential mail and address it to the Ombudsman.

Ms Allen: I would imagine, coming from the adult estate, certainly when the formal inspections occur, focus groups are run by all the residents. I am sorry, I said “residents”. In Boronia, we do not call them prisoners; we call them residents. When the inspections occur, there are always focus groups held in confidence between the inspector’s staff and the residents.

Supt Heslington: That is correct.

Ms Allen: I am assuming they would do the same with the young people.

Supt Heslington: That is correct. They ask for specific cohorts and different groups. We just set them up for them to have the meetings with.

The CHAIR: I see. This is different to the walking around.

Supt Heslington: This is when we have inspections.

Ms Allen: This is when a formal inspection occurs.

The CHAIR: Out of formal inspections, so this is not twice a year by the Ombudsman?

Supt Heslington: No. But also, every single month we have independent visitors who come in and they have free rein to walk around. The young people, just by seeing them in the area, can approach them and go and ask them or make a complaint with them. They come back and debrief with the deputy superintendent. They also do a formal written report through OICS. That comes to the superintendent who makes sure that all of the complaints are addressed, all documented, and all is sent back to OICS so that they can see what is being done about the complaints.

Ms Allen: Just to add to that: that is where, as a manager, you get most of the feedback as to the feeling and the concerns that the people that you are looking after have. There is not a tick-a-box thing; they can just approach and have that. That is written up through the independent prison visitor. Sometimes it really is just things like, "I'd like an extra blanket." We can actually address any queries that they have at that early stage, but that is written up and given to us in a formal report, and that report is kept on record for the custodial inspector's office.

I have certainly had queries come to me, as superintendent, that if they think there might be a theme emerging—say they are getting a lot of queries about clothing or something like that—then we will be approached directly from a liaison officer that is assigned to each facility from custodian inspectorates to say, "There seems to be a theme coming through here. We'd like to come out and speak to you more about this issue." I have always found that is a good way because I acknowledge that a lot of the—I will say it—ladies that we deal with, their education level is often not very good. English can be their second and third language. They feel a little more comfortable just talking rather than the put-in-a-form approach.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: My question is slightly off topic. You mentioned Boronia. It is my understanding that children up to a certain age are able to reside at Boronia. Is that still the case?

Ms Allen: Yes, certainly. I mentioned Boronia because that model is applied across the whole of the department to all other prisons. I am just using Boronia as a point of reference. Yes, children do reside with not just their biological mother, but if we can see that that person has been caring for them in the community, at Boronia up to the age of four years and then up to the age of 12 years, we allow the children to come in and have extended overnight weekend visits with their mothers or primary caregivers.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: You may need to take this on notice; I expect you would: how many children aged four and under would currently be residing at Boronia?

Ms Allen: It varies. The last time I was briefed on that was only a few weeks ago, and we had nine children there at that time. The children come and go. They sometimes go out and stay with grandparents for a weekend, or dad takes them, so they come and go. But there were nine at that point.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Are there specific services and supports that are provided for those children?

Ms Allen: Yes. We have a contracted service provider that comes in and engages one on one with the mothers. We also have options, if the mother chooses, for the children to go to day care each day, or whatever days they wish. When we do that, the mother brings their children up to the front of the area, an officer takes them down in the vehicle, drops them off with mum, and mum goes back at the end of the day and picks the children up and brings them back. We also have a dedicated position called a manager of family and children services who will bring in any services that we might see as an individual need. There might be an individual need where a mother might be struggling. We run a therapy music group. We have a therapy specialist who comes in and engages with mother and child to help them with play and interaction like that. Our intent is to try to keep mother and child together if we possibly can. We have had such a demand that we have actually had women coming to prison with children in their care and we have had to expand our residential program to include another house. We used to have two houses but now we have actually got three that can cater for this.

[12.50 pm]

The CHAIR: Clearly, the majority of your services go to children who are not in custody.

Ms Allen: Yes.

The CHAIR: I think the annual report figure is about 1 500 in the community and about 150 in detention; is that right?

Supt Heslington: Just under, at present.

The CHAIR: What services do you deliver for the—how do we refer to them—children in the community?

Ms Kraszlan: Children in community would depend on the order that they received from the court. They could be referred to a juvenile justice team, which would involve police; the family; sometimes the victim, depending on the victim's preference; and the young person. They could also get a good behaviour bond, a youth community-based order, there are intensive youth supervision orders, and finally detention or a condition of release order. They would then be provided with one-to-one youth justice service from a community youth justice officer.

The CHAIR: None of those children and young people would come under the jurisdiction of OICS, would they?

Ms Kraszlan: At this point, no, they do not come under the jurisdiction of OICS.

The CHAIR: What sort of oversight services are provided for them?

Ms Kraszlan: These are where the department will be working with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on the oversight recommendations to come up with an integrated whole-of-government model.

The CHAIR: Are there currently any oversight provisions?

Ms Kraszlan: No, not that I am aware of.

Ms Allen: Not that I am aware of.

Ms Kraszlan: Nothing specific to the extent that exists with the Inspector of Custodial Services.

The CHAIR: What options are you pursuing there through the whole-of-government approach?

Ms Kraszlan: We are working with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on a range for these ones, and they will come back to us with some models.

The CHAIR: Does the department have input into that process?

Ms Kraszlan: The department at this point would want to keep OICS as the preferred oversight model in detention. We feel that it is open and transparent, and it has the processes and models that currently exist. We will then work with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet on looking at what options are available for a community oversight model.

The CHAIR: Where are those options coming from? Is the department being asked to put up options, or are you simply observers?

Ms Kraszlan: At this point we are participating in the working group but have not reached a defined decision on which model we would prefer.

The CHAIR: Are you considering a number of different models?

Ms Kraszlan: Yes.

The CHAIR: Can you outline any of those to the committee?

Ms Kraszlan: At this point there has been no fixed decision on what those models would be.

The CHAIR: Do you have a preferred model?

Ms Kraszlan: Not that I have been given advice on, no, apart from custodial. We have a distinct view on the Inspector of Custodial Services.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: I am a bit unclear. You said that you have not made a decision—that is fine—and that there are a number of models being looked at; yet we have just asked, and I am no clearer as to what potential models you are even looking at.

Ms Kraszlan: The models that have been put up include the children and young person, the Ombudsman, expanding custodial services, and also we have the OPCAT options. Of those, there has been no decision on a final preferred model.

The CHAIR: You are actually the agency overseeing the implementation of OPCAT, are you not?

Ms Kraszlan: The Department of Justice is overseeing the implementation of OPCAT, yes.

The CHAIR: It is the department's responsibility to oversee its implementation; that is not referred to DPC?

Ms Kraszlan: No, that is not referred to DPC, and at this point there is no decision yet on who would do the national monitoring.

The CHAIR: For OPCAT?

Ms Kraszlan: For OPCAT.

The CHAIR: Right. What is happening within the department to ensure that the obligations under OPCAT are met?

Ms Kraszlan: There has been a recommendation given to the minister, but as yet there has been no final decision.

The CHAIR: I see. Michele, could you please put the chart up on the screen. You have mentioned the whole-of-government approach that is being led by DPC. Can you tell the committee which parts of that structure the department has input into?

Ms Kraszlan: The department has representation on the director general's implementation group through the director general; on the royal commission subgroup; we are part of the Department of Communities working group on child safe standards; we have a significant role in the redress working group; we are part of the oversight working group; and we are responsible for the criminal justice working group.

The CHAIR: That is under your direction, is it?

Ms Kraszlan: The criminal justice working group with regards to the recommendations from the criminal justice report.

The CHAIR: So you are actually on all those groups?

Ms Kraszlan: We are on all those groups.

The CHAIR: There is not a group there that you are not on?

Ms Kraszlan: No.

The CHAIR: Right, that is very clear. Thank you. I think that might be the end of our formal questions. I will ask my colleagues whether there is anything else that they would like to take up with you.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: I have a question on education in Banksia Hill. Say Billy gets given six or eight months' detention. He has finished court, and he turns up in January. Billy is 13 or 14. When he is at school, he wags and that, but he is in detention; he cannot go anywhere else. Is it optional for him to receive an education?

Supt Heslington: No, he has to receive an education.

Mr K.M. O'DONNELL: Technically, the kids who go to Banksia Hill should be leaving with the education that is required; they are not missing out on education?

Supt Heslington: All the children within Banksia Hill attend education, apart from the post-compulsory age group, who are also offered the ability to be able to continue education if they need to, or learn some workplace skills.

The CHAIR: Are you aware of the recent Productivity Commission report that found that a significant proportion of children were not receiving an education at Banksia Hill?

Supt Heslington: That was from previous, I believe.

Ms Kraszlan: Yes. The Productivity Commission report takes its data on four separate days during the course of the year. During the course of the particular year that reported the low figures, on one of the days that the report took its data, there was a significant incident in Banksia Hill, so the children were in lockdown or not available to attend education. The other day, there were significant staff shortages. But we are aware now that education has gone to a 98 —

Supt Heslington: It is 99. For term 1 in 2019, there was 99 per cent attendance.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much for your attendance here today. I will formally bring the hearing to a close by thanking you for your evidence before the committee today. A transcript of this hearing will be forwarded to you for correction of minor errors. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days of the date of the letter attached to the transcript. If the transcript is not returned within this period, it will be deemed to be correct. New material cannot be added via these corrections and the sense of your evidence cannot be altered. Should you wish to provide additional information or elaborate on particular points, please include a supplementary document for the committee's consideration when you return your corrected transcript of evidence. Thank you very much for coming in today.

Hearing concluded at 12.58 pm
