

convenient for Airis to litigate in Georgia as well. *Id.* The Phillips Defendants also assert that Georgia has a strong interest in policing the practice of accounting within the state, while Texas has little interest in overseeing Georgia accountants. *Id.* Finally, they assert that the interests of the interstate judicial system are best served by litigating the issues in Georgia because all parties have offices and relevant witnesses in Georgia. *Id.*

Plaintiffs argue that defendants have not made a compelling showing that litigating the matter in Texas presents an unreasonable burden on them. Dkt. 33 at 10. Plaintiffs also argue that any burden on the Phillips Defendants of having to travel to Texas to litigate would be equally felt by forcing plaintiffs to litigate in Georgia. *Id.* at 11. Plaintiffs also point out that any inconvenience defendants claim cannot be described as so gravely difficult and inconvenient that defendants would be at an unfair and severe disadvantage. *Id.* And, plaintiffs assert, Texas has strong interests in adjudicating a suit involving a corporation with a principal place of business in Houston, and the Phillips Defendants have shown no evidence that Georgia's interest is any greater than that of Texas.


Given that minimum contacts exist and defendants cannot put forth more concrete or compelling reasons as to why it is unfair to have to defend their actions in Texas, the court believes that it does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice to maintain the lawsuit in Texas.

### III. CONCLUSION

Defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (Dkt. 29) is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED.

Signed at Houston, Texas on July 27, 2015.



Gray H. Miller  
United States District Judge