
Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/3] Signal semantics for pid namespaces

Posted by [Oleg Nesterov](#) on Mon, 03 Sep 2007 17:10:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 09/03, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

>

> Oleg Nesterov [oleg@tv-sign.ru] wrote:

> | On 08/31, sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

> | >

> | > @@ -48,7 +49,7 @@ static int sig_init_ignore(struct task_s

> | > if (likely(!is_container_init(tsk->group_leader)))

> | > return 0;

> | >

> | > - if (!in_interrupt())

> | > + if (is_current_in_ancestor_pid_ns(tsk) && !in_interrupt())

> | > return 0;

> |

> | We should return 1 in that case, afaics the logic is wrongly reversed.

>

> Hmm. My unit tests worked as I thought they should :-)

>

> return 1 implies we "ignore the signal" right ?

Oops.

> If the signal is from an ancestor namespace, and we are not in interrupt

> context, we don't want to ignore the signal. no ?

You are right of course, sorry ;)

Oleg.

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>
