Hostile takeovers have fallen out of favour in recent years, as confidence amongst corporate leaders shrank during the financial crisis. But now [Pfizer](http://www.pfizer.com/) is preparing to embark on a no-holds barred battle for the hostile takeover of [Astra-Zeneca](http://www.astrazeneca.co.uk/home), so we look back at some of the biggest attempted takeovers of the past decade.

1. AOL and Time Warner, $164bn, 2000

When [AOL announced](http://news.cnet.com/2100-1023-235400.html) it was taking over the much larger and successful [Time Warner](http://www.timewarner.com/), it was hailed the deal of the millennium. But the dotcom boom meant the new AOL Time Warner lost over $200bn in value in less than two years.

2. Sanofi-Aventis and Genzyme Corp, $24.5bn, 2010

[Sanofi](http://en.sanofi.com/) fought hard to takeover biotechnology company [Genzyme](http://www.genzyme.com/) in 2010. It had to offer significantly more per share than they initially wanted before triggering a top-up option to assume control over around 90 percent of its target company.

3. Nasdaq OMX/IntercontinentalExchange and NYSE Euronext, $13.4bn, 2011

In a battle for control over the New York Stock Exchange, [Nasdaq](http://www.nasdaq.com/) was determined to undermine Deustche Borse’s bid to buy the NYSE parent company with an unsolicited and valuable bid. Nasdaq was ultimately forced to withdraw its $13.4bn offer amid concerns from regulators.

4. Icahn Enterprises and Clorox, $11.7bn, 2011

When [Clorox](http://www.thecloroxcompany.com/) refused Icahn’s bid of $10bn, CEO Carl Icahn sent a full-caps letter to the Clorox board directly telling them shareholders should decide on the takeover. Though the bid was eventually raised to $11.7bn, Icahn was eventually forced to withdraw and drop the push for a proxy fight.

5. Air Products & Chemicals and Airgas, $7.94bn, 2010

[Airgas](http://www.airgas.com/) was forced to take Air Products to court in Delaware to avoid the hostile takeover, after the buyer attempted to seal the deal over the course of a year. The main point of contention was the price per share Air Products was offering, and eventually a judge sided with the short-changed seller.