## Bug 702851 - use-after-free vulnerability in igc\_reloc\_struct\_ptr() from PDF file

Alias: None

Product: Ghostscript
Component: Security (public) (show other bugs)
Version: 9.25
Hardware: PC Linux

Status: RESOLVED WORKSFORME

Importance: P4 normal
Assignee: Chris Liddell (chrisl)

Keywords:

Depends on:

URL:

Blocks:

**Reported:** 2020-08-28 19:59 UTC by Todd **Modified:** 2020-09-02 07:08 UTC (<u>History</u>)

CC List: 7 users (show)

See Also:

**Customer:** 

Word Size:

## Attachments

Add an attachment (proposed patch, testcase, etc.)

#### Note

You need to log in before you can comment on or make changes to this bug.

# Todd 2020-08-28 19:59:55 UTC Description Overview: When testing for BZ $\pm$ 701818 in ghostscript-9.25, I found a use-after-free which looks unrelated to that bug. It occurs when the crafted PDF PoC file is provided as input to ghostscript. 1. Download https://bugs.ghostscript.com/attachment.cgi?id=18402 2. Compile ghostscript with AddressSanitizer 3. run: gs -dBATCH -dNOPAUSE -dSAFER -dNOTRANSPARENCY -sOutputFile=tmp -sDEVICE=xpswrite \$PoCExpected result: ghostscript displays an error and exits, or otherwise handles the input Actual result: ASAN shows that ghostscript performs a use-after-free: ==<u>1298203</u>==ERROR: AddressSanitizer: heap-use-after-free on address 0x62a000678250 at pc 0x000002664563 bp 0x7ffc94c166a0 sp 0x7ffc94c16690 at pc 0x0 [16/7539] READ of size 4 at 0x62a000678250 thread T0 #0 0x2664552 in igc reloc struct ptr psi/igc.c:1279 #1 0x1ccd294 in basic reloc ptrs base/ysmemory.c:347 #2 0x26683fc in gc\_do\_reloc psi/igc.c:1246 #3 0x2668017 in gs\_gc\_reclaim psi/igc.c:450 #4 0x27764da in context\_reclaim psi/zcontext.c:290 #5 0x2518dcc in gs\_wreclaim.psi/ireclaim.c:163 #6 0x2518dcc in ireclaim psi/ireclaim.c:80 #7 0x24f258c in interp reclaim psi/interp.c:447 #8 0x24f258c in interp reclaim psi/interp.c:447 #8 0x24bd784 in gs\_main\_finit\_psi/imain.c:914 #9 0x53174e in main\_psi/gs.c:138 #10 0x7f29b4ca7la2 in \_libc\_start\_main ../csu/libc-start.c:308 #10 0x7f29b4ca7la2 in \_libc\_start\_main\_c/su/libc-start.c:308 #10 foxf259b4ca7la2 in \_libc\_start\_main\_si/su/si/sidst-git/ghostscript/ghostscript-9.25/bin/gs+0x53c28d) READ of size 4 at 0x62a000678250 thread TO 0x62a000678250 is located 80 bytes inside of 22536-byte region (0x52a000678220,0x62a00067da08) freed by thread T0 here: #1 0x7f29b50929f in \_\_interceptor\_free (/lib64/libasan.so.5+0x10d91f) #1 0x1bd5720 in alloc\_free\_clump base/gsalloc.c:2599 previously allocated by thread TO here: #0 0x7f29b5c92d8 in \_interceptor\_malloc (/lib64/libasan.so.5+0x10dd18) #1 0x1c97ae in gs\_heap\_alloc\_bytes\_base/gsmalloc.c:193 Environmental information: OS: Fedora 31 Software: ghostscript-9.25 Compiler: GCC 9.3.1

I'm aware this is an old version of ghostscript, but wanted to share this for

informational purposes. I did see BZ#695318, but the backtrace is a bit different there and looks like it could be a different issue.

#### Ray Johnston 2020-08-28 20:44:48 UTC

Comment 1

Please re-test with the 9.53.0 Release Candidate:

https://github.com/ArtifexSoftware/ghostpdl-downloads/releases/tag/ghostpdl-9.53.0rc2

If it is reproducible, then re-open this bug (change the "Status" to confirmed)

We really don't appreciate someone submitting bugs for old versions -- it takes time, even if it just asking you to test with the latest available (in this case the 9.53.0 Release candidate). Wouldn't you rather have us spending time on things that are actually still problems.

chris-liddell released Ghostscript/GhostPDL 9.25 on Sep 13, 2018

### Ken Sharp 2020-08-29 12:56:35 UTC

Comment 2

(In reply to Todd from comment #0)

- > When testing for BZ#701818 in ghostscript-9.25, I found a use-after-free > which looks unrelated to that bug. It occurs when the crafted PDF POC file > is provided as input to ghostscript.
- > Steps to reproduce:
- 1. Download  $\frac{https://bugs.ghostscript.com/attachment.cgi?id=18402}{2. Compile ghostscript with AddressSanitizer}$ 2. Comp 3. run:

In order to reproduce the problem it is necessary to use the 9.25 released code, later releases do not exhibit the issue. The 9.25 release was the 13th September 2018.

In bug 701818 we can see from the address sanitizer stack that this particular use-after-free isn't present. Now that report was against a SHA representing a commit between releases, in fact from 31st October 2019.

So this tells us that the problem had already been fixed by this point. Using Git bisect I find that the relevant commit was this one:

https://git.ghostscript.com/? p=ghostpdl.git;a=commit;h=ece5cbbd9979cd35737b00e68267762d72feb2ea

This was not \*intended\* to fix this specific problem, but it clearly does.

I would highly recommend using Git bisect in cases like this, its quick (on Linux) it only took me an hour or so to locate this commit, and will find cases like this where a problem was unwittingly fixed as a consequence of something else.

Obviously its up to you whether you choose to take on that commit in order to resolve the use-after-free problem, from our point of view the problem has already been fixed in our current code base.

I've changed the resolution to 'worksforme' as there was a problem here, but its already been resolved.

## Todd 2020-09-01 16:13:10 UTC

Thanks for looking into it. My intention of course was mostly to inform about the bug for documentation purposes, knowing that this is not even close to the current version.

Appreciate the reference to Git Bisect as this is a useful tool I can add to my toolbox, and the specific commit you referenced.

Just to be comprehensive, I checked it with  $9.53.0 \, \text{RC2}$  in my environment and it did not trigger a use-after-free. Instead, I got this output:

~/Downloads/ghostpdl-9,53.0rc2/sambin 8./gs -dBATCH -dNOPAUSE -dSAFER -dMOTRANSPARENCY -solutputFile-timp -sDEVICE-xpswrite -/Downloads/xps\_finish\_gGPL Ghostscript RELEASE CANDIDATE 2 9.53.0 (2020-08-27) Copyright (C) 2020 Artifex Software, Inc. All rights reserved.
This software is supplied under the GNU AGPLv3 and comes with NO WARRANTY: see the file COPYING for details.
Processing pages 1 through 3. ownloads/xps\_finish\_poc.pdf

Page 1
 \*\*\*\* Error: Error reading font stream, attempting to load the font using its

name
Output may be incorrect.
Querying operating system for font files...
Substituting font Times-Roman for EPKNCP+TimesNewRomanPSMT.
Loading NimbusRoman-Regular font from %rom%Resource/Font/NimbusRoman-Regular...
4467604 2911804 4167968 2833129 4 done.
Page 2
Substituting font Helvetica for Tahoma.
Loading NimbusSans-Regular font from %rom%Resource/Font/NimbusSans-Regular...
4533716 3085400 4369968 2998819 4 done.
Substituting font Helvetica for ArialMT.
\*\*\*\* Error reading a content stream. The page may be incomplete.
Output may be incorrect.
\*\*\*\*\* Error reading a content stream. The page may be incomplete.
Output may be incorrect.
Fage 3

Page 3
Substituting font Helvetica for Tahoma.
\*\*\*\* Error reading a content stream. The page may be incomplete.
Output may be incorrect.

\*\*\*\* This file had errors that wer repaired or ignored.
\*\*\*\* The file was produced by:
\*\*\*\* >>>> Acrobat Distiller 9.5.2 (Windows) <<<<
\*\*\*\* Please notify the author of the software that produced this
\*\*\*\* file that it does not conform to Adobe's published PDF
\*\*\*\* specification.

\*\*\*\* The rendered output from this file may be incorrect

So ghostscript of course properly catches the problem in 9.53RC2 as you stated.

Is it ok to make this public at this point?

## Ken Sharp 2020-09-01 16:20:49 UTC

Comment 4

(In reply to Todd from comment #3)
> Thanks for looking into it. My intention of course was mostly to inform
> about the bug for documentation purposes, knowing that this is not even

> about the bug for documentat: > close to the current version.

Technically it is (I think) \*just\* still supported for customers (not quite 2 years

> Is it ok to make this public at this point?

Well its been 'fixed', even if its incidentally, for 18 months so I can't see any reason why not. Might be nice to wait for Chris to give it his blessing, seeing as how he owns the bug, but he's on vacation today. Do you mind waiting until tomorrow for a response from him?

## Todd 2020-09-01 16:39:53 UTC

Comment 5

(In reply to Ken Sharp from  $\frac{\text{comment } \#4}{\text{tomorrow for a response from him }}$ 

Absolutely can wait. Thanks.

Chris Liddell (chrisl) 2020-09-02 07:08:22 UTC

Comment 6

I don't see any issue making it public.

Format For Printing - XML - Clone This Bug - Top of page