
Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/5][9PFS] Cleanup explicit check for mandatory locks
Posted by [Eric Van Hensbergen](#) on Mon, 17 Sep 2007 14:51:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On 9/17/07, Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org> wrote:

> The __mandatory_lock(inode) macro makes the same check, but
> makes the code more readable.

>

> Signed-off-by: Pavel Emelyanov <xemul@openvz.org>

> Acked-by: Eric Van Hensbergen <ericvh@gmail.com>

>

> ---

>

> fs/9p/vfs_file.c | 2 +-
> 1 files changed, 1 insertion(+), 1 deletion(-)

> diff --git a/fs/9p/vfs_file.c b/fs/9p/vfs_file.c

> index 2a40c29..7166916 100644

>

> diff --git a/fs/9p/vfs_file.c b/fs/9p/vfs_file.c

> index 2a40c29..7166916 100644

> --- a/fs/9p/vfs_file.c

> +++ b/fs/9p/vfs_file.c

> @@ -105,7 +105,7 @@ static int v9fs_file_lock(struct file *f

> P9_DPRINTK(P9_DEBUG_VFS, "filp: %p lock: %p\n", filp, fl);

>

> /* No mandatory locks */

> - if ((inode->i_mode & (S_ISGID | S_IXGRP)) == S_ISGID)

> + if (__mandatory_lock(inode))

> return -ENOLCK;

>

> if ((IS_SETLK(cmd) || IS_SETLKW(cmd)) && fl->fl_type != F_UNLCK) {

>

>