
Subject: Re: [PATCH] struct file leakage

Posted by [Andrew Morton](#) on Tue, 11 Jul 2006 23:30:08 GMT

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

Trond Myklebust <trond.myklebust@fys.uio.no> wrote:

```
>
> > > - if (error)
> > > + if (error) {
> > > + /* Does someone understand code flow here? Or it is only
> > > +  * me so stupid? Anathema to whoever designed this non-sense
> > > +  * with "intent.open".
> > > +  */
> > > + if (!IS_ERR(nd->intent.open.file))
> > > +  release_open_intent(nd);
> > >  return error;
> > > + }
> > >  nd->flags &= ~LOOKUP_PARENT;
> > >  if (nd->last_type == LAST_BIND)
> > >  goto ok;
> > >
> >
> > It's good to have some more Alexeycomments in the tree.
> >
> > I wonder if we're also needing a path_release() here. And if not, whether
> > it is still safe to run release_open_intent() against this nameidata?
> >
> > Hopefully Trond can recall what's going on in there...
>
> The patch looks correct, except that I believe we can skip the IS_ERR()
> test there: if we're following links then we presumably have not tried
> to open any files yet, so the call to release_open_intent(nd) can be
> made unconditional.
```

Sorry, but phrases like "looks correct" and "I believe" don't inspire confidence. (Although what you say looks correct ;)) Are you sure?

And do we also need a path_release(nd) in there?
