
Subject: Re: Re: [PATCH] Fix user struct leakage with locked IPC shem segment
Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Tue, 17 Jul 2007 09:15:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Tue, 17 Jul 2007 13:07:55 +0400 Kirill Korotaev <dev@sw.ru> wrote:

> Andrew Morton wrote:
> > On Mon, 16 Jul 2007 16:24:12 +0400
> > Pavel Emelianov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:
> >
> >
> >>When user locks an ipc shmem segment with SHM_LOCK ctl and the
> >>segment is already locked the shmem_lock() function returns 0.
> >>After this the subsequent code leaks the existing user struct:
> >
> >
> > I'm curious. For the past few months, people@openvz.org have discovered
> > (and fixed) an ongoing stream of obscure but serious and quite
> > long-standing bugs.
>
> thanks a lot :@)
>
> > How are you discovering these bugs?
>
> Not sure what to answer :) Just trying to do our best.

hm, OK, I was visualising some mysterious Russian bugfinding machine or something.

Don't stop ;)

> This bug was thought over by Pavel for about 3 month after a single
> uid leak in container was detected by beancounters' kernel memory accounting...
>
> >>== ipc/shm.c: sys_shmctl() ==
> >> ...
> >> err = shmem_lock(shp->shm_file, 1, user);
> >> if (!err) {
> >> shp->shm_perm.mode |= SHM_LOCKED;
> >> shp->mlock_user = user;
> >> }
> >> ...
> >>==
> >>
> >>>Other results of this are:
> >>>1. the new shp->mlock_user is not get-ed and will point to freed
> >> memory when the task dies.
> >

> >

> > That sounds fairly serious - can this lead to memory corruption and crashes?

>

> Yes it can. According to Pavel when the shmem segment is destroyed it

> puts the mlock_user pointer, which can already be stalled.

OK, thanks, I'll feed a copy in stable@kernel.org's direction.
