
Subject: Re: [PATCH] Memory shortage can result in inconsistent flocks state
Posted by [bfields](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 19:06:53 GMT

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

On Tue, Sep 11, 2007 at 04:38:13PM +0400, Pavel Emelyanov wrote:

> This is a known feature that such "re-locking" is not atomic,
> but in the racy case the file should stay locked (although by
> some other process), but in this case the file will be unlocked.

That's a little subtle (I assume you've never seen this actually happen?), but it makes sense to me.

> The proposal is to prepare the lock in advance keeping no chance
> to fail in the future code.

And the patch certainly looks correct.

I can add it to my (trivial) lock patches, if that's helpful--it'll get folded into the branch -mm pulls from and I can pass it along to Linus for 2.6.24.

What I don't have that I wish I did is good regression tests for the flock or lease code (for posix locks I've been using connectathon, though that misses some important things too).

--b.
