Stack Buffer Over flow testing and fixing vulnerable code snippets

BAD example which is vulnerable towards array out of bound issue.

Broken and vulnerable code:

```
/* BAD: checks only lower bound; any idx >= 10 will write out of bounds */
static void demo_index_bad(int idx) {
   puts("== index BAD demo ==");
   int buffer[10] = {0};
   dump_buffer(buffer, 10);

   if (idx >= 0) { /* BUG: no upper bound check */
        printf("Writing buffer[%d] = 1 (BAD path)\n", idx);
        buffer[idx] = 1; /* OOB write if idx >= 10 */
   } else {
        puts("Index is negative; skipping write.");
   }

   dump_buffer(buffer, 10);
}
```

Code Fix done:

```
/* GOOD: checks both 0 <= idx < 10 before writing */
static void demo_index_good(int idx) {
   puts("== index GOOD demo ==");
   int buffer[10] = {0};
   dump_buffer(buffer, 10);

   if (idx >= 0 && idx < 10) {
      printf("Writing buffer[%d] = 1 (GOOD path)\n", idx);
      buffer[idx] = 1;
   } else {
      printf("Index %d out of range [0, 9]; not writing.\n", idx);
   }

   dump_buffer(buffer, 10);
}</pre>
```

Implementation Results:

Output from Bad and Vulnerable code, stack overflow happens and it overwrites the memory.

```
gcc -00 -g -Wall -Wextra -Wshadow -Wconversion -fno-omit-frame-pointer -
fsanitize=address, undefined cwe121_showcase.c -o cwe121_showcase
./cwe121_showcase index-bad 10
./cwe121_showcase index-good 10
== index BAD demo ==
buffer: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]
Writing buffer[10] = 1 (BAD path)
cwe121_showcase.c:106:15: runtime error: index 10 out of bounds for type
 'int [10]'
cwe121_showcase.c:106:21: runtime error: store to address 0x7ccbe4500058
with insufficient space for an object of type 'int'
0x7ccbe4500058: note: pointer points here
 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00
e4500058 at pc 0x5fae4a042fcd bp 0x7ffe6c676510 sp 0x7ffe6c676500
WRITE of size 4 at 0x7ccbe4500058 thread TO
    #0 0x5fae4a042fcc in demo_index_bad /home/arunr99/cwe121_showcase.c:
106
    #1 0x5fae4a043b1d in main /home/arunr99/cwe121 showcase.c:175
    #2 0x7ccbe682a1c9 (/lib/x86_64-linux-gnu/libc.so.6+0x2a1c9) (BuildI
d: 274eec488d230825a136fa9c4d85370fed7a0a5e)
    #3 0x7ccbe682a28a in __libc_start_main (/lib/x86_64-linux-gnu/libc.s
o.6+0x2a28a) (BuildId: 274eec488d230825a136fa9c4d85370fed7a0a5e)
    #4 0x5fae4a0423e4 in _start (/home/arunr99/cwe121_showcase+0x43e4) (
BuildId: 3d2b810e664aafbbdcf40a69225f4f214e10bb35)
Address 0x7ccbe4500058 is located in stack of thread T0 at offset 88 in
frame
    #0 0x5fae4a042d7b in demo_index_bad /home/arunr99/cwe121_showcase.c:
99
  This frame has 1 object(s):
    [48, 88) 'buffer' (line 101) <== Memory access at offset 88 overflow
s this variable
HINT: this may be a false positive if your program uses some custom stac
k unwind mechanism, swapcontext or vfork
      (longjmp and C++ exceptions *are* supported)
```

```
Shadow byte legend (one shadow byte represents 8 application bytes):
  Addressable:
 Partially addressable: 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 Heap left redzone: fa
  Freed heap region:
  Stack left redzone:
                            f2
f3
 Stack mid redzone:
  Stack right redzone:
  Stack after return:
  Stack use after scope:
  Global redzone:
                            f6
 Global init order:
 Poisoned by user:
                            f7
 Container overflow:
  Array cookie:
  Intra object redzone:
  ASan internal:
                           fe
 Left alloca redzone:
  Right alloca redzone:
```

Output from Fixed code, runs successfully without causing an array out of bounds as stack overflow has been fixed here.

```
== index GOOD demo ==
buffer: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]
Index 10 out of range [0, 9]; not writing.
buffer: [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]
arunr99@ArunR99:~$
```

BAD example which is vulnerable towards a Memory copy issue.

Broken and vulnerable code:

Code Fix done:

```
/* GOOD: Copies only what fits into charFirst[], and NUL-terminates */
static void demo_memcpy_good(void) {
    puts("== memcpy GOOD demo ==");
    CharVoid s;
    memset(&s, 0, sizeof(s));
    const char *message = "ORIGINAL_POINTER_DATA";
    s.voidSecond = (void*)message;
    s.voidThird = (void*)(message + 1);

    print_struct(&s, "before");

    const char *SRC = "SAFE_COPY_DEMO";
    /* Correct: limit by destination field size minus 1, then NUL-terminate */
    size_t dstsz = sizeof(s.charFirst);
    size_t n = strlen(SRC);
    if (n >= dstsz) n = dstsz - 1;
    memcpy(s.charFirst, SRC, n);
    s.charFirst[n] = '\0';

    print_struct(&s, "after");
}
```

Implementation Results:

Output from Bad and Vulnerable code, buffer overflow happens dues to the memory copy issue.

```
k unwind mechanism, swapcontext or vfork
  (longjmp and C++ exceptions *are* supported)
SUMMARY: AddressSanitizer: stack-buffer-overflow ../../../src/libsani
tizer/sanitizer_common/sanitizer_common_interceptors_format.inc:563 in p
rintf_common
Shadow bytes around the buggy address:
=>0x742cfea00000: f1 f1 f1 f1 00 00 00 00[f2]f2 f2 f2 00 00 00 00
0x742cfea00080: 00 00 00 00 f3 f3 f3 f3 00 00 00 00 00 00 00
```

```
Shadow byte legend (one shadow byte represents 8 application bytes):
 Addressable:
                        00
 Partially addressable: 01 02 03 04 05 06 07
 Heap left redzone:
 Freed heap region:
 Stack left redzone:
                          f1
 Stack mid redzone:
 Stack right redzone:
 Stack after return:
 Stack use after scope:
                          f9
 Global redzone:
 Global reuzone:
Global init order:
                          f6
                          f7
 Poisoned by user:
 Container overflow:
                          fc
 Array cookie:
 Intra object redzone: bb
 ASan internal:
                        fe
 Left alloca redzone:
 Right alloca redzone:
==2399==ABORTING
```

Output from Fixed code, runs successfully without causing any memory copy issue as the buffer overflow has been fixed.

```
== memcpy GOOD demo ==
[before] charFirst="" voidSecond=0x56bc6eb68120 voidThird=0x56bc6eb681
21
[after] charFirst="SAFE_COPY_DEMO" voidSecond=0x56bc6eb68120 voidThird
=0x56bc6eb68121
arunr99@ArunR99:~$
```