

---

Subject: Re: [patch 5/9] unprivileged mounts: allow unprivileged bind mounts  
Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Tue, 08 Jan 2008 19:08:34 GMT

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

---

```
> On Tue, 2008-01-08 at 12:35 +0100, Miklos Szeredi wrote:
> > +static int reserve_user_mount(void)
> > +{
> > +    int err = 0;
> > +
> > +    spin_lock(&vfsmount_lock);
> > +    if (nr_user_mounts >= max_user_mounts && !capable(CAP_SYS_ADMIN))
> > +        err = -EPERM;
> > +    else
> > +        nr_user_mounts++;
> > +    spin_unlock(&vfsmount_lock);
> > +    return err;
> > +}
>
> Would -ENOSPC or -ENOMEM be a more descriptive error here?
```

The logic behind EPERM, is that this failure is only for unprivileged callers. ENOMEM is too specifically about OOM. It could be changed to ENOSPC, ENFILE, EMFILE, or it could remain EPERM. What do others think?

Miklos

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---