

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 03 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

SHAYA BAIRD, on behalf of herself and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SABRE, INC.; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 14-55293

D.C. No. 2:13-cv-00999-SVW-  
JPR

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Stephen V. Wilson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 1, 2016\*\*  
Pasadena, California

Before: D.W. NELSON, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Shaya Baird appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Sabre, Inc. ("Sabre") regarding her claim under the Telephone Consumer

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Protection Act (“TCPA”). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

The TCPA restricts certain calls<sup>1</sup> using an automatic dialing system<sup>2</sup> or an artificial or prerecorded voice absent “prior express consent.” 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). The Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”), having authority to prescribe regulations to implement the TCPA, *see* 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(2), determined that “persons who knowingly release their phone numbers have in effect given their invitation or permission to be called at the number which they have given, absent instructions to the contrary.” *In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991, Report and Order*, 7 FCC Rcd. 8752, 8769 (Oct. 16, 1992) (“1992 Order”).

1. The FCC’s interpretation of “prior express consent” may not be challenged in the context of this appeal. The Hobbs Act provides the court of appeals with “exclusive jurisdiction to enjoin, set aside, suspend (in whole or in part), or to determine the validity of . . . all final orders of the Federal Communications

---

<sup>1</sup>The TCPA’s prohibition “applies to text messages . . . as well as voice calls.” *In re Rules & Regulations Implementing the Tel. Consumer Prot. Act of 1991*, 19 FCC Rcd. 15927, 15934 (Aug. 12, 2004).

<sup>2</sup>Sabre argues that the messaging system used to send Baird the text message is not an automatic dialing system. We decline to reach this issue, because we affirm the district court on the grounds that Baird consented to the text message.

Commission.” 28 U.S.C. § 2342. A party may invoke this jurisdiction “only by filing a petition for review of the FCC’s final order in a court of appeals naming the United States as a party.” *US W. Commc’ns v. MFS Intelenet, Inc.*, 193 F.3d 1112, 1120 (9th Cir. 1999). This suit was not brought pursuant to the Hobbs Act. As a result, the validity of the FCC’s interpretation of “prior express consent” must be presumed valid. *See US W. Commc’ns, Inc. v. Jennings*, 304 F.3d 950, 958 n.2 (9th Cir. 2002) (“Properly promulgated FCC regulations currently in effect must be presumed valid for the purposes of this appeal.”). Accordingly, Baird’s argument that providing her phone number did not constitute prior express consent is foreclosed in light of the 1992 Order.

2. Baird expressly consented to the text message in question when she provided Hawaiian Airlines with her cellphone number. Baird knowingly released her phone number to Hawaiian Airlines while making a flight reservation. She did not provide any “instructions to the contrary” indicating that she did not “wish[] to be reached” at that number. *See* 1992 Order, 7 FCC Rcd. at 8769. Therefore,

according to the 1992 Order, Baird provided “prior express consent” to receive the text message in question.<sup>3</sup>

**AFFIRMED.**

---

<sup>3</sup>In *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, we concluded that a person’s consent to receive calls from one business does not constitute consent to receive calls from a different business. 569 F.3d 946, 955 (9th Cir. 2009). A similar situation exists here—Baird provided her phone number to Hawaiian Airlines, but was contacted by Sabre. However, unlike in *Satterfield*, Sabre is a vendor for Hawaiian Airlines and contacted Baird regarding her reservation. *Cf. id.* (“[T]he record shows no direct contractual relationship between Nextones and Simon & Schuster.”). The district court made no distinction between Sabre and Hawaiian Airlines because of the relationship between the companies, and Baird does not make any argument based on this distinction.

## United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Office of the Clerk  
95 Seventh Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

### Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings

#### Judgment

- This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

#### Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

- The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

#### Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1)

#### Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

#### (1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
  - ▶ A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
  - ▶ A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
  - ▶ An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

#### B. Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

- A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- ▶ Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ▶ The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- ▶ The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

**(2) Deadlines for Filing:**

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- *See* Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

**(3) Statement of Counsel**

- A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

**(4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))**

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at [www.ca9.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov) under *Forms*.
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

### **Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)**

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at [www.ca9.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov) under *Forms*.

### **Attorneys Fees**

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at [www.ca9.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov) under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

### **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari**

- Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at [www.supremecourt.gov](http://www.supremecourt.gov)

### **Counsel Listing in Published Opinions**

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published opinion, please send a letter **in writing within 10 days** to:
  - ▶ Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; St. Paul, MN 55164-0526 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
  - ▶ and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using “File Correspondence to Court,” or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

BILL OF COSTS

This form is available as a fillable version at:

http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/uploads/forms/Form%2010%20-%20Bill%20of%20Costs.pdf.

Note: If you wish to file a bill of costs, it MUST be submitted on this form and filed, with the clerk, with proof of service, within 14 days of the date of entry of judgment, and in accordance with 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. A late bill of costs must be accompanied by a motion showing good cause. Please refer to FRAP 39, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, and 9th Circuit Rule 39-1 when preparing your bill of costs.

Form fields for case name, v., and 9th Cir. No.

The Clerk is requested to tax the following costs against:

Table with columns: Cost Taxable under FRAP 39, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, 9th Cir. R. 39-1; REQUESTED (Each Column Must Be Completed); ALLOWED (To Be Completed by the Clerk). Rows include Excerpt of Record, Opening Brief, Answering Brief, Reply Brief, Other\*\*, and TOTAL.

\* Costs per page: May not exceed .10 or actual cost, whichever is less. 9th Circuit Rule 39-1.

\*\* Other: Any other requests must be accompanied by a statement explaining why the item(s) should be taxed pursuant to 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. Additional items without such supporting statements will not be considered.

Attorneys' fees cannot be requested on this form.

Continue to next page

**Form 10. Bill of Costs - Continued**

I, , swear under penalty of perjury that the services for which costs are taxed were actually and necessarily performed, and that the requested costs were actually expended as listed.

Signature

("s/" plus attorney's name if submitted electronically)

Date

Name of Counsel:

Attorney for:

---

*(To Be Completed by the Clerk)*

Date

Costs are taxed in the amount of \$

Clerk of Court

By: , Deputy Clerk