

---

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 (!lin_interrupt())
> | > + if (is_current_in_ancestor_pid_ns(tsk) && !lin_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 :-)
```

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

---