
Subject: FindFile.IsSymLink() broken

Posted by [sam_](#) on Thu, 30 Jul 2009 09:03:09 GMT

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

Hi all. I know it's not very polite to introduce myself with bug report, but...

I would expect following code snippet to return true for "link" (tested on Linux Mint 7.0; based on Ubuntu Jaunty):

```
#include <Core/Core.h>
```

```
using namespace Upp;
```

```
CONSOLE_APP_MAIN
```

```
{
    String parentDir = GetFileDirectory(GetExeFilePath()), targetDir = AppendFileName(parentDir,
    "dir");
    //RealizeDirectory(targetDir);
    //Sys(Format("ln -s %s link", targetDir));
    Sys(Format("ln -s %s link_to_dir", GetExeFilePath()));
    FindFile ff(AppendFileName(parentDir, ""));
    while (ff.Next()) {
        Cout().PutLine(Format("%s: %s", ff.GetName(), ff.IsSymLink() ? "true" : "false"));
    }
    Cout().PutLine(Sys("ls -la " + parentDir));
    DeleteFile(AppendFileName(parentDir, "link"));
    DirectoryDelete(targetDir);
}
```

According to <http://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/jaunty/en/man2/stat.2.html> problem is in stat() call being used instead of lstat()

If this behaviour was actually intended, I suggest adding default parameter to both FindFile constructors:

```
FindFile(bool use_lstat = false);
```

```
FindFile(const char *name, bool use_lstat = false);
```

or perhaps

```
FindFile(const char *name, bool use_lstat = false);
```

```
bool Search(const char *path, bool use_lstat = false);
```

My preference is to use lstat() only. Thanks for great framework, Lubos

Subject: Re: FindFile.IsSymLink() broken

Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 01 Aug 2009 07:12:38 GMT

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

Maybe we should use lstat only to detect the link?

Mirek

Subject: Re: FindFile.IsSymLink() broken
Posted by [sam_](#) on Mon, 03 Aug 2009 07:32:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's fine with me. Thanks, Lubos

Subject: Re: FindFile.IsSymLink() broken
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 08 Aug 2009 22:13:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[sam_](#) wrote on Mon, 03 August 2009 03:32 That's fine with me. Thanks, Lubos

Implemented and committed. Thanks for reporting.

Mirek
