

TOP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWYERS 2017

Christa M. Anderson

FIRM

Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP

CITY

San Francisco

SPECIALTY

Litigation

Anderson's clients include Google Inc., New Relic Inc., Veeva Systems Inc., Sutter Health, Williams-Sonoma Inc. and Qualcomm Inc.

For New Relic, a San Francisco-based software analytics company, Anderson led the defense when CA Inc.'s CA Technologies sued over patents in the application performance management realm. The plaintiff claims that New Relic violated three patents; Anderson's defense focuses on denials of infringement and contentions that the patents are invalid. Since the case began in 2012 she has won summary judgment on one patent and convinced CA Technologies to drop some claims. Remaining issues are set for jury trial later this year. *CA Technologies Inc. v. New Relic Inc.*, 2:12-cv-05468 (E.D. N.Y., filed Nov. 5, 2012).

"There are really two important processes in preparing for trial," Anderson said. "There's logistics: you need to become very organized. You work out a marching plan." Also: "How much time will you have for your presentation? Which are the important documents? Once you're in trial, things move so quickly that you don't have time to waste minutes revising your plan."

In another case in litigation, Veeva offers cloud-based services for the life sciences industry. A rival sued over trade secret theft allegations in January, claiming that five former employees now employed by Veeva had improperly used confidential information obtained at their former company. The plaintiff also contended that some of the workers violated non-compete provisions in their former employment contracts.

Anderson said she moved quickly for Veeva to compel arbitration. "The claims all turn on the obligations of former employees," she said. "We're still waiting for a ruling." *Medidata Solutions Inc. v. Veeva Systems Inc.*, 1:17-cv-00589 (S.D. N.Y., filed Jan. 26, 2017).

Earlier for Veeva, Anderson led the defense when a different competitor sued over patent infringement allegations. The patents at issue relate to the creation of email messages using multiple layers and content available on servers. She successfully narrowed the scope of the case from five patents to two, then persuaded the court that one patent is invalid. Finally, she secured a favorable settlement for the client. *Prolifiq Software Inc. v. Veeva Systems*



Inc., 13-cv-3644 (N.D. Cal., filed Aug. 6, 2013).

"Veeva is a very interesting and innovative company with excellent leadership," Anderson said. "It's exciting to work for them and to represent them in court."

— John Roemer