



## Trishala Parikh

Associate

[trishala.parikh@wilsonelser.com](mailto:trishala.parikh@wilsonelser.com)

San Francisco, CA – 415.625.9274

Trishala Parikh focuses her practice on defending companies and individual practitioners in the life sciences and health care industries against claims related to medical malpractice and professional liability. She has extensive experience handling all phases of trial preparation, including conducting and defending depositions, drafting dispositive and pretrial motions, managing written discovery, and coordinating trial strategy.

Before joining Wilson Elser, Trishala worked at a California defense firm, where she represented physicians, pharmacists, and insurance companies in various professional liability matters.

Trishala holds a J.D. degree from Osgoode Hall Law School, an M.B.A. degree from the Schulich School of Business, and a degree in medical sciences from Western University, all in Canada. Her multidisciplinary academic background provides a strong foundation for understanding the operational and regulatory environments in which her clients operate.

### Education

- Osgoode Hall Law School, York University (J.D., 2021)
  - Hennick Center Business Law Internship Award
- Schulich School of Business, York University (M.B.A., 2021)
- Western University, London, Ontario (B. MSc., 2017)

### Bar Admissions

- California

### Languages

### Services

- Health Care Law
- Medical Malpractice & Health Care

- Gujarati

## Client Wins

### **Song and Parikh Prevail on a Demurrer in Organ Donation Litigation**

Jianlin Song (Partner-San Francisco) and Trishala Parikh (Associate-San Francisco) obtained dismissal with prejudice for two nationally recognized nonprofit eye bank clients on a demurrer in the Superior Court of Solana County, California. The case involved allegations of unauthorized organ donation arising from a highly sensitive end-of-life situation. The court sustained our demurrer in full, dismissing negligence claims against our clients without leave to amend and concluding that the plaintiffs could not state a viable cause of action as a matter of law. The plaintiff's motion for reconsideration was denied.