Subject: [PATCH -mm] proc: remove pathetic ->deleted WARN_ON
Posted by Alexey Dobriyan on Tue, 13 Mar 2007 14:23:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

WARN_ON(de && de->deleted); is sooo unreliable. Why?

```
proc_lookup    remove_proc_entry
===========    =================
lock_kernel();
spin_lock(&proc_subdir_lock);
[find proc entry]
spin_unlock(&proc_subdir_lock);
     spin_lock(&proc_subdir_lock);
     [find proc entry]

proc_get_inode
==============
WARN_ON(de && de->deleted);   ...

     if (!atomic_read(&de->count))
      free_proc_entry(de);
     else
      de->deleted = 1;
```

So, if you have some strange oops [1], and doesn't see this WARN_ON it means
nothing.

[1] try_module_get() of module which doesn't exist, two lines below
    should suffice, or not?

Signed-off-by: Alexey Dobriyan <adobriyan@sw.ru>
---

```
 fs/proc/inode.c |    2 --
 1 file changed, 2 deletions(-)

--- a/fs/proc/inode.c
+++ b/fs/proc/inode.c
@@ -418,8 +418,6 @@ struct inode *proc_get_inode(struct supe
 {
  struct inode * inode;

- WARN_ON(de && de->deleted);
-
  if (de != NULL && !try_module_get(de->owner))
   goto out_mod;
```