

Forum: [Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [\[Share/OpenSource\] LiteCode - The ultimate anti-cracker for .Net Framework](#)

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 8:03 am

Hey guys whats up

I was thinking of sharing this because it's really awesome to have since there are just too many crackers now

So what LiteCode will do basically is connecting to a server using the SSP protocol (<http://ssp.codeplex.com>) for creating a encrypted/compressed secure connection

And what it will allow is asking the server if he will for us execute some code instead of the client having the code

So see it as a proxy for the code you want to execute

So for example a scenario without LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now crypt your .exe but all the code is stored in the .exe and so if you bypass the login you're still able to crypt your file

A scenario with LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now send his .exe you wanted to crypt + settings to the server so now at server side hes able to crypt your file and sending back the FUD .exe

This way you don't need the code at the crypter.exe so if they will bypass your login system they wouldn't be able to crypt ther file

And now you can even update the crypter remotely incase it will become detectable ?

What you'll get from using LiteCode:

Smaller executables

The private code will be 100% private

Your code cannot be seen anymore by a cracker or decompiler

No obfuscation required

The code can be updated remotely this will allow you quick bug fixing and no more .exe downloads everytime something is updated

Everyone is having the same version since all of your code is ran at the server everyone will use

Don't worry about JIT Hooking since this will be useless now

When your not using LiteCode:

Your code can be cracked/stolen

Everyone can see your code

You need to use obfuscation but even that can be deobfuscated by de4dot or any other deobfuscator

... and many more reasons

Github - Opensource: <https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode>

Since you don't need a lot of knowledge about networking other then that u need to know how to

port forward u'll be fine

Most of the code you write will look the same like you had before

For example lets take this class which is normally in your .exe

When you look at this example you can clearly see your password can be stolen

Code class TestClass

```
{
    private string Password;
    public TestClass()
    {
        this.Password = "VerySecretPassword";
    }

    public string CallMe()
    {
        return "Hello World";
    }
}
```

Now lets take a look when your doing it in LiteCode

Client side class

Code class TestClass : ITest

```
{
    public TestClass()
    {

    }

    [RemoteExecution]
    public string CallMe()
    {
        return "";
    }
}
```

Server side class:

Code class TestClass : ITest

```
{
    private string Password;
    public TestClass()
    {
        this.Password = "VerySecretPassword";
    }

    [RemoteExecution]
    public string CallMe()
    {
        return "Hello World";
    }
}
```

As you can see the method bodies in the client side are empty but in the server side you can see the password and in CallMe what it returns "Hello World"

While in the client side you can't even see what it returns so that's for the server to decide

Also you can see both the server and client are using the ITest interface which is

Code public interface ITest

```
{  
    string CallMe();  
}
```

Pretty straight forward interface, just 1 method "CallMe" and both in Server/Client classes you need to have the RemoteExecution attribute for security reasons

The code looks pretty much the same and you need to think about the the client side class methods will never be called it's just a dummy class

So now when your opening your .Net Reflector opening the client.exe you'll see there is no password what so ever

If you would do in the CallMe method "return this.Password;" only then you will get the password

Also keep in mind that you don't want to change anything in a Form or maybe calling API's since it will be done server sided

So all the code which has nothing to do design/visual u need to put it in the Litecode so it can stay hidden and not cracked

Now you can also create the best login system since no one can crack the server side code

You can simply create a login system and do extra checks at methods to see if ur really loggedin etc... if not don't execute the code it's that simple and it can't be executed by the cracker by forcing it

Here is example code you need to use for the server to get it up and running

Code namespace Server

```
{  
    class Program  
    {  
        static void Main(string[] args)  
        {  
            LiteServer server = new LiteServer(1234);  
            server.onClientConnect += (Client c) =>  
            {  
                c.ShareClass("test", typeof(TestClass), c);  
            };  
            Console.WriteLine("Providing remote code at port 1234");  
            Process.GetCurrentProcess().WaitForExit();  
        }  
    }  
  
    class TestClass : ITest  
    {  
        public Client client;  
        public TestClass(Client c)  
        {  
            this.client = c;  
        }  
  
        [RemoteExecution]  
        public string TestMe()  
        {  
            return "Hello World, I bet u couldn't get this code above :)";  
        }  
  
        [RemoteExecution]  
        public int GetRandomNumber()  
        {
```

```

Random rnd = new Random(DateTime.Now.Millisecond);
return rnd.Next(int.MinValue, int.MaxValue);
}
}

```

```

public interface ITest
{
string TestMe();
int GetRandomNumber();
}
}

```

Here is example code you need to use for the client to get it up and running
Code namespace Client

```

{
class Program
{
static void Main(string[] args)
{
LiteClient client = new LiteClient("YOUR IP ADDRESS", 1234);
ITest test = client.GetSharedClass<ITest>("test", typeof(Dummy_Testy));
}
}
}

```

```

public class Dummy_Testy : ITest
{
[RemoteExecution]
public string TestMe()
{
return "";
}
}

```

```

[RemoteExecution]
public int GetRandomNumber()
{
return 0;
}
}

```

```

public interface ITest
{
string TestMe();
int GetRandomNumber();
}
}

```

}any comments/questions are welcome ?

CyNecx - July 7, 2012, 8:36 am

But you can also dump the code or ? and if anyone attack the server its useless or ? :/

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 8:40 am

(Jul 7, 2012 08:36 AM)BlueC0der Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) But you can also dump the code or ? and if anyone attack the server its useless or ? :/You can't dump the code since it's being at server side and ye the down side is when ur server is down that the program stops working

Exit - July 7, 2012, 9:09 am

I will be using this..for my project.

Thanks. =']

soft2050 - July 7, 2012, 9:47 am

This seems to be really good. Going to check this out soon! Thumbs up

Edit: Just read the whole thread and it seems to be quite good. So this seems to be a quite good alternative for WCF (Windows Communication Foundation) which does almost the same thing!

Edit once more again: I was able to bypass and change the data recieved by a little trick, but that way could be avoided by a little bit of obfuscation and extra checks! Not uncrackable but could be used as a good anti to hide from kiddo's and actually good to hide shit from leechers that will just use de4dot and make a exact replica of good applications out there!

(° ? °) - July 7, 2012, 10:12 am

(Jul 7, 2012 08:40 AM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You can't dump the code since it's being at server side and ye the down side is when ur server is down that the program stops working
Can't you somehow get the dump of the code after it is transferred to the client?

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 10:17 am

(Jul 7, 2012 10:12 AM)Subotai Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Can't you somehow get the dump of the code after it is transferred to the client?No code is being transfered to the client, Only the return value from the method

Immortal - July 7, 2012, 10:19 am

I was working on some thing like this for my program :F damn you dragon you always beat me to the good stuff :G Looks good but code cant be 100% private cause you would still see it.

the download takes me to <http://www.theinternetvshollywood.com/>

dreamer66 - July 7, 2012, 10:23 am

Although it's a good idea in theory (and possibly one of the best anti-cracking techniques up to this date) you do realise how many people have issues with this kind of licence systems right ? :p

A software that requires internet for pretty much all the core functions will probably lose a lot of credibility and possible buyers just of "DRM".

Immortal - July 7, 2012, 10:36 am

Can you change the download link or pm with a working one :F

infamousnoone - July 7, 2012, 10:49 am

so what happens when someone MITM's the client/server by stripping out the encrypt/decrypt from the client and sends to your server malicious code which results in it getting hijacked, etc. etc.

edit: It would appear I read this wrong, since it seems the code is being sent s->c, apologies.

I for see this being used for purposes other than u intended though, lol.

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 11:05 am

(Jul 7, 2012 10:49 AM)infamousnoone Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) so what happens when someone MITM's the client/server by stripping out the encrypt/decrypt from the client and sends to your server malicious code which results in it getting hijacked, etc. etc.

edit: It would appear I read this wrong, since it seems the code is being sent s->c, apologies.

I for see this being used for purposes other than u intended though, lol. The client only sends to the server which method he has to call and he just executes that and sends back the result

So no code is being send to the server, but ye u can just go man in the middle and change the value like... from false to true and client will think ur loggedin or something

but what if 100% of ur code is being in LiteCode, If u make a variable called LoggedIn and as default it's false

U do at every single method "if(!LoggedIn) return;" then you has to be loggedin otherwise no method is going to execute

(° ? °) - July 7, 2012, 11:06 am

(Jul 7, 2012 10:17 AM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) No code is being transfered to the client, Only the return value from the method

So all the code is being executed on the server, and the client just gets return values?

What if you need to write a file, or read a file from the HD. How is that going to work if the server does not have access to the client's physical machine?

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 11:08 am

(Jul 7, 2012 11:06 AM)Subotai Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So all the code is being executed on the server, and the client just gets return values?

What if you need to write a file, or read a file from the HD. How is that going to work if the server does not have access to the client's physical machine? For stuff like that ofcourse it wouldn't work but for alot of other code it will just work fine

or you can just use the server's hdd if you want ofcourse

Ok guys the link is updated I heard some people saying that it's redirecting u to some other site or whatever... so here is a new link

<http://www.4shared.com/rar/JOjgDvda/LiteCode.html>

facebookdoom - July 7, 2012, 4:00 pm

Looks good. But I'm wondering why one can't make a simple TCP client/server?

Client sends 'hey execute function one'

Server sends 'okay executing, here is the return value ...'

Client handles return value and deals with it.

What exactly are the pros of it?

Oh and the download requires an account, you should up it to minus.com.

Banks? - July 7, 2012, 4:20 pm

Here's mirror to minus.com.

<http://minus.com/mlVDbx49s>

DragonHunter - July 7, 2012, 4:34 pm

(Jul 7, 2012 04:00 PM)facebookdoom Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Looks good. But I'm wondering why one can't make a simple TCP client/server?

Client sends 'hey execute function one'

Server sends 'okay executing, here is the return value ...'

Client handles return value and deals with it.

What exactly are the pros of it?

Oh and the download requires an account, you should up it to minus.com. Well with that u need to make first a whole library or putting the whole thing hardcoded and with LiteCode ur just good to go and no need to have knowledge about sending packets

facebookdoom - July 7, 2012, 4:39 pm

(Jul 7, 2012 04:34 PM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well with that u need to make first a whole library or putting the whole thing hardcoded and with LiteCode ur just good to go and no need to have knowledge about sending packets

That is true. Definitely a nice project. Do you have any suggestions on places where one could get a affordable Windows VPS? Also I just tried your example and I keep getting the "InterfacePrototype msut be a interface and public" exception, which is at
"LiteCode.Shared.DynamicClassCreator.CreateDynamicClass[InterfacePrototype](Type BaseType, SharedClass sharedClass)"

(Jul 7, 2012 04:20 PM)?anksy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Here's mirror to minus.com.

<http://minus.com/mlVDbx49s>

Thanks.

????? - July 7, 2012, 8:07 pm

This is pretty damn cool. But one question; is this basically suppose to be like a terminal to the real application, or does it return a value to the desktop application? I may be way off, didn't look at all of the code.

DragonHunter - July 8, 2012, 3:11 am

(Jul 8, 2012 01:38 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Okey guys, imagine that, you code a crypter , you obviously only want some people to crypt, so you check via an mysql database and php if the user is in the database, and then you let them crypt

Now all a cracker needs to do is removing that mysql/php check and let other people crypt too.

Now with this kind of security code he posted, you can tell his a username and password and hardwareid, if its in the database it returns the crypted file, if its not then it wont return it.

Now you cant crack this one, since the method to crypt the file is on the server and not in the application itself.

This can still be cracked, tho :DLemme post soon in the cracker section a very simple login program and lets see who will be able to receive a file ;)

Also I updated the download link with the new version of SSP

new updates from SSP:

Fixed some minor bugs

Fixed Man-In-The-Middle attacks, the keys are now generated dynamicly calculated at the real data

<http://ssp.codeplex.com/SourceControl/changeset/changes/17958>

So in short with the new SSP if you would change just 1 byte

with wpe pro or something before it's being handled by the client/server or send for fun a packet the next time you send/receive data the data is raped

.CRz - July 8, 2012, 4:36 am

(Jul 8, 2012 04:25 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, its still not uncrackable, since all you need to do is patch the compiled bin :p

So crypters are still able to get cracked... but its getting harder and harder now, because we now have to write a builder and replace the crypted files resources with a new server

The objective is not getting it uncrackable but yes increase your protection drastically than you was using obfuscators.

It is a almost perfect protection, and one of the reasons it isnt is becuse it needs internet access, but who cares? Everyone has internet. Is not just that, i'm sure there are some weak points of this kind of protection.

But i never saw such thing before.

dreamer66 - July 8, 2012, 6:24 am

I think everyone is forgetting how easy it is to DDoS these days. It just takes 1 bored person to ruin the experience for all your customers.

Assault - July 8, 2012, 6:35 am

(Jul 8, 2012 06:24 AM)dreamer66 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think everyone is forgetting how easy it is to DDoS these days. It just takes 1 bored person to ruin the experience for all your customers.

Multiple servers, firewalls, blah.

Also, a majority of the people on HF use whored bots/shells to DDoS. There isn't much to worry about on these forums, and you shouldn't be worrying about getting attacked.

Ex; You can run a website, but it only takes one person to take it down. Why would you run it?

dreamer66 - July 8, 2012, 6:41 am

(Jul 8, 2012 06:34 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Implying that wouldn't be a problem if you didnt used this protection.

We are talking about local vs online software protection. Obviously ddosing your home connection (which getting the IP is harder than just checking were does your software connects to) won't affect the software if the program doesn't need to connect online to get the data.

(Jul 8, 2012 06:35 AM)Assault Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Multiple servers, firewalls, blah.

So you are saying that in order for me to be able to run this kind of protection system I would need to set up a whole network just to be able to keep my server up ? Not to mention that even big companies got DDoS'ed down (LoL servers, Sony, the list goes on and on, so firewalls and multiple servers can only do that much). Not to mention the extra money and maintenance this will require from the administrator.

DragonHunter - July 8, 2012, 6:56 am

If anyone is interested in trying to crack a simple crackme I made here u go (

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=2657930>)

"idonotcare" if ur good in cracking give it a try, It's like u said, login, build and there u go, let's see if there is a weakness hehe^.^

.CRz - July 8, 2012, 7:12 am

(Jul 8, 2012 06:14 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) What the fucking fuck are you talking about? A

internet connection being a disadvantage?

How the fuck are you suppose to get your customers? Do you meet them at a bus station and give them a fucking usb drive and tell them the software is on there? Obviously you are advertising it online so no internet is no fucking disadvantage.

Sorry for the rage, but stuff like that is just plain stupid and makes no sense.

Anyway, its actually sick what dragonhunter did, he is surprising me all the time.

One question tho, how do you execute code online? Like does a application on a vps do that and then return the results or what? Didn't really looked into your example.
you shouldn't talk with that rage becuse probably unlike you my mind is not closed to hf space. what if you use this protection for a company where they have only intranet?

you can still connect to server without internet.

lets give an proper example, not all software requires internet connection, using this protection would just take that advantage.

i'm not saying it isn't good, in fact is EXTREAMLY good for most of cases.
in some cases internet connection is good, orhers not.
are we clear now?

Washi - July 8, 2012, 7:15 am

I really like the idea, however i'm just thinking about when your computer is turned off, the software cannot be used anymore 'till you start up your computer again. Not everyone wants his computer turned on 24 hours a day.

But good job =D

soft2050 - July 8, 2012, 7:18 am

(Jul 8, 2012 07:15 AM)TheUnknownProgrammer Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I really like the idea, however i'm just thinking about when your computer is turned off, the software cannot be used anymore 'till you start up your computer again. Not everyone wants his computer turned on 24 hours a day.

But good job =DThats why this would require a Windows VPS or Dedicated Server just like websites need.

I would like to propose one suggestion if possible of hosting the server side through a c++ code that can be run on a linux server too. I remember that in WCF this implementation is possible.

CyNecx - July 8, 2012, 7:46 am

what about using a Asp.net that will make the connection secure too ;)

Banks? - July 8, 2012, 8:16 am

(Jul 8, 2012 01:38 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Okey guys, imagine that, you code a crypter , you obviously only want some people to crypt, so you check via an mysql database and php if the user is in the database, and then you let them crypt

Now all a cracker needs to do is removing that mysql/php check and let other people crypt too.

Now with this kind of security code he posted, you can tell his a username and password and

hardwareid, if its in the database it returns the crypted file, if its not then it wont return it.

Now you cant crack this one, since the method to crypt the file is on the server and not in the application itself.

This can still be cracked, tho :D

I had basically the same idea with my crypter. Except I send the encrypted codedom source if the server sided check goes through.

MrNRG - July 8, 2012, 9:52 am

So are you planing to releases it?

It now has 35 characters

Aeonhack Archivist - July 8, 2012, 11:47 am

(Jul 8, 2012 09:52 AM)MrNRG Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So are you planing to releases it?

It now has 35 characters

Check the first post. He has a link to the basic client to try and hack and it includes binaries of it..

Banks? - July 8, 2012, 12:19 pm

(Jul 8, 2012 08:20 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thats called cloud stub and i and some other people use it already.

[img]http://i0.kym-cdn.com/photos/images/newsfeed/000/210/119/+_2acc5a8841f8752904d37f90a8014829.png?1322693145[/img]

DragonHunter - July 9, 2012, 4:23 am

Ok It's now opensource at <http://litecode.codeplex.com/> will update LiteCode from time to time ^^

Local Celeb - July 9, 2012, 2:12 pm

This is one hell of an interesting concept!

I do have one question though. Is it only returning values such as "true" or "false", strings and other variables, or is it returning whole-bits of code to be executed?

DragonHunter - July 9, 2012, 2:54 pm

(Jul 9, 2012 02:12 PM)Asydix Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is one hell of an interesting concept!

I do have one question though. Is it only returning values such as "true" or "false", strings and other variables, or is it returning whole-bits of code to be executed?You basically can just return anything as long u can serialize it, so ye u can just return booleans, strings, objects, classes etc ^.^

TheDubWubCub - July 10, 2012, 1:29 pm

very interesting, pretty similar to what i created a while back "Symbiotic Enigma" except yours is by far more efficient and secure. The main difference was that SE, instead of getting the code from the server, it would decrypt the code from resources. I saw that in your version, the code isn't even sent to the app and instead just the "return value from the method". I personally like that feature since it makes it not susceptible towards dumping. I was going to later improve this to a online server version similar to what you have already created. I also noticed you made a crackme version and if "yck1509" can't crack it then you should be good to go! :D

Congrats and great job man! :D

DragonHunter - July 10, 2012, 2:50 pm

(Jul 10, 2012 02:00 PM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Actually we can crack it, but he doesn't gives out the login details, all it needs is a valid login from which i can dumb the data i need for the crack

Its like you have an encrypted .rar file, ofcourse its secure because its encrypted, but once i got the key, i can decrypt it -.Ok proof it us you will be able to dump something that is actual useful

Username: I_Am_A_Cheater

Password: Fake_Login_idonotcare

Btw I just disabled the download for this account otherwise it would be cheating for other people really trying to crack it I hope u can understand that
havefun ^.^

shadow1992 - July 11, 2012, 1:34 am

So basically you created an Application service provider ASP. . .awesome!

DragonHunter - July 11, 2012, 3:01 am

(Jul 11, 2012 02:38 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Seriously dragon, you are now getting stupid

You post a app, where only someone with a legit login can download a application , YOU CANT CRACK THAT but if you sold this at the marketplace, all a cracker would need is a valid license, then he could dumb the stuff which gets downloaded after the license check

I can code you your security system in 2 minutes, seriously.Well if you can't crack it with some legit info like I gave it you then you just failed, Your the one who asked for it
And recoding the security system which is a if/else, I would say go for it

DragonHunter - July 11, 2012, 3:24 am

(Jul 11, 2012 03:15 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 100 EURO that you cant crack it.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=2667270>

Btw, its fun that you say that, because you said for yourself with the login info i cant download the app, so where is the point in giving me a login info which doesnt works? Thats just as if you didnt gave me a login info at all.You said several times you could crack it with legit info so I just gave it, You never specified what you were going to crack

If you meant you could crack it because you were able to download something well that's not having it cracked

DragonHunter - July 11, 2012, 3:37 am

(Jul 11, 2012 03:27 AM)idonotcare Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Your app downloads something after it gets a legit login, doesnt it? So all we need is a legit login, you gave me one but you also said that account isnt able to download the file, i mean dafuq? Where was the point at giving me the login then anyway? Because you said you could crack it that way, go fight futher in the crack section where it belongs, anyway

Uploaded a update of LiteCode, Still needs alot of work but here is some example

At server side you would be able to do stuff like

```
Code client.System.Cursor.Position = new Point(500, 500);
```

```
client.System.Cursor.Hide();
```

Will soon add so ur able to use Sockets, FileStream etc

.CRz - July 11, 2012, 4:29 am

will the ladies stop crying?

@idontcare - I Dont Care what you said, the real situation is that you didn't bypassed this security

MatiasMunk - July 11, 2012, 1:42 pm

I'm using this already for all of my projects :)

Thnx mate, repped.

DragonHunter - July 14, 2012, 5:10 am

some updates...

Fixed a error "Ambiguous match found." this happen'd when there are multiple methods with the same name but with different arguments

Begun working at SharedDelegate

Almost added the Graphics class

Created ReturnResult, Now we're able to see if the target method gave a exception and more updates

MatiasMunk - July 14, 2012, 12:31 pm

Using the updated one now, thanks <3.

I just love this thing!

Crabrat - July 15, 2012, 8:29 am

Nice share, could be extremely useful. You're a credit around here DragonHunter :)

DragonHunter - July 15, 2012, 8:39 am

Added a scenario why you should use LiteCode

So for example a scenario without LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now crypt your .exe but all the code is stored in the .exe and so if you bypass the login you're still able to crypt your file

A scenario with LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now send his .exe you wanted to crypt + settings to the server so now at server side hes able to crypt your file and sending back the FUD .exe

This way you don't need the code at the crypter.exe so if they will bypass your login system they wouldn't be able to crypt ther file

And now you can even update the crypter remotely incase it will become detectable ?

.CRz - July 15, 2012, 8:59 am

one of the biggest advantages of this system is that you can update as you want without having an updater xD, you can update anytime you want without your customers notice. and that is truly awesome

MatiasMunk - July 15, 2012, 12:41 pm

@Cyber, that is exactly what I'm using it for ;)

I'm working on a game atm, I'm using LiteCode for that.

Then people don't have to download new versions everytime.

But they just come straight in there :)

DragonHunter - July 16, 2012, 3:14 am

Ok people I added support for delegates which is now also in the SVN
what your able todo now is in short:

1. You are at the server side and you call a method TestDelegate and you give your private method as delegate
2. When TestDelegate method is being called in client side the client is able to call the delegate which will go back to the server and call your private method

this way you can just call BeginInvoke methods which require a callback method or
BeginSend/BeginReceive from the Socket class

Example code - Server Side:

PHP Code

<?php

```
LiteServer server = new LiteServer(539);
server.onClientConnect += (Client client) =>
{
    ITest test = client.GetSharedClass<ITest>("test", typeof(TestClass));
    string ret = test.TestDelegate(":O", (string val) =>
    {
        return "some value...";
    });
    Console.WriteLine(ret);
}
```

Example code - Client Side:

PHP Code

<?php

[RemoteExecution]

```
public string TestDelegate(string SomeValue, TestDel CallMe)
{
    return "Value from server side: " + CallMe("some string from Client Side :)");
}
```

output at server side:

Value from server side: some value...

BaussHacker - July 16, 2012, 5:15 am

It's useful, but again useless.

You only request some data from the server, however you never handle anything for the client. You still need to handle your application clientside, which you can still do.

This is not helping against cracking, but against reverse-engineering/reflecting.

Great job tho! As always you make impressive projects.

dreamer66 - July 16, 2012, 7:29 am

Of course it helps vs cracking, take a look at Diablo III and why it hasn't been cracked yet (at least not by the scene).

The only issue, as Diablo III suffered from that as well was the amount of requests and the sheer raw power a server needed to have in order to accommodate all the requests without failing. And that is without taking in account the DDoS attacks a small company will encounter.

DragonHunter - July 18, 2012, 6:25 am

SSP bug fix:

Fixed a critical bug, Packets were receiving before you could set the onReceiveData event

This is now also fixed in LiteCode, E.g. You call a remote method "test.TestCall();" the packet is being sent for calling that method but the event is not set yet at the client or server

So the packet is being processed in SSP but he was not able to call the onReceiveData since it was still NULL

This bug most of the time only happen'd tho using it at localhost

Incorporate - July 26, 2012, 9:48 am

And this is a project I planned on doing over the Summer, except mine wasn't as complicated as this :(

Deobfuscated - July 28, 2012, 2:46 am

(Jul 16, 2012 05:15 AM)BaussHacker Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's useful, but again useless.

You only request some data from the server, however you never handle anything for the client. You still need to handle your application clientside, which you can still do.

This is not helping against cracking, but against reverse-engineering/reflecting.

Great job tho! As always you make impressive projects.

[img]http://images1.wikia.nocookie.net/__cb20120213055636/uncyclopedia/images/5/52/Double-fac
epalm.jpg[/img]

jinxat - July 28, 2012, 3:42 pm

Sounds interesting gonna give this a try, Thanks!

Fake. - July 30, 2012, 6:36 am

(Jul 15, 2012 08:39 AM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Added a scenario why you should use LiteCode

So for example a scenario without LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now crypt your .exe but all the code is stored in the .exe and so if you bypass the login you're still able to crypt your file

A scenario with LiteCode:

1. You start ur crypter and u login
2. You fillin some settings and u press crypt
3. The crypter will now send his .exe you wanted to crypt + settings to the server so now at server side hes able to crypt your file and sending back the FUD .exe

This way you don't need the code at the crypter.exe so if they will bypass your login system they wouldn't be able to crypt ther file

And now you can even update the crypter remotely incase it will become detectable ?

Sneaky. I did this successfully a while back, but nowhere near in as much depth. Great job :)

Windows servers are often hard to find though (compared to Linux).

Tritium - August 6, 2012, 1:36 pm

Somebody already got this running on a windows vps?

Got any problems or was it as easy as compiling and starting?
Would be interested in this but don't want to waste money on a server when I can't get it working...

DragonHunter - November 19, 2012, 4:53 pm
just doing it so others can see it :P

DragonHunter - November 20, 2012, 5:21 pm
Just some recent updates,
LiteCode:
No more need for a dummy/base class
Added PacketQueue, NoWait, UdpMethod attributes
Updated the delegates
The UdpMethod attribute will let you call methods over the UDP protocol
The NoWait attribute will not wait till the other side completed the method and does not wait till the packet is being sent
The PacketQueue attribute will use the PacketQueue from SSP, could increase performance
And more updates ;)

SSP (Secure Socket Protocol):
Improved performance of the DataShuffler
More stability and other updates

Wrote a small article at codeproject if people like u can also read here some stuff,
<http://www.codeproject.com/Articles/496593/LiteCode-Remotely-call-methods-over-the-network>

Assault - November 22, 2012, 2:31 pm
@OP

I don't mean to burst your bubble, but doesn't ASP.NET Web Services do the same thing as this?

Angelkiss - March 28, 2014, 9:28 am
doesn't work on windows 8 , how to use please :) ?

geraldososa - March 29, 2014, 7:45 am
Can you add a method to send a message to client or to the server?

Zap~ - April 2, 2014, 12:52 pm
The place won't let me download.
Can you upload to somewhere normal like a webserver or something?
I would gladly host it on my server if you want.

PathogenDubz - April 3, 2014, 2:58 am
(Nov 22, 2012 03:31 PM)Assault Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) @OP
I don't mean to burst your bubble, but doesn't ASP.NET Web Services do the same thing as this?
Yeah I don't mean to be rude, but as Assault said ASP.NET does exactly this. Still a great project though.

Anon E. Mouse - April 7, 2014, 7:41 am
Another great program by DragonHunter. I wish you would continue your work on L2PacketX.
You are the guy who wrote the lameguard bypass, no?

'An0ny - May 18, 2014, 11:18 am
Looks very promising, anyone had issues with this yet?

DragonHunter - May 18, 2014, 1:01 pm

(Apr 7, 2014 07:41 AM)Anon E. Mouse Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Another great program by DragonHunter. I wish you would of continued your work on L2PacketX. You are the guy who wrote the lameguard bypass, no?Thanks ? funny that you're talking about L2PacketX, just thought about it yesterday that it would be fun working on it again to mess around in the game ?

And yeah I bypassed LameGuard, not only that I also unpacked it even tho it was protected by Themida, it was quite fun to see what it does ?

qqhf - May 18, 2014, 7:39 pm

Yeah I thought of doing something like this, actually it was really similar however everything would have to be hosted serverside.

DDoS attacks on a crypter can completely cut out clients being able to use it and this'll require a lot of bandwidth considering files need to be transferred.

'An0ny - May 19, 2014, 5:20 am

You can always purchase reverse proxies, or just buy a DDoS Protected Hosting that looks promising?

Dispersia - May 19, 2014, 7:32 am

(May 19, 2014 05:20 AM)An0ny Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You can always purchase reverse proxies and then the proxy goes down and the connection is still cut. That wouldn't really change much lol.

arun9020 - May 19, 2014, 7:56 pm

Dude, this is fucking cool. Any way c# is not my main language, i will use it in vb.

I had this idea for ages, but never knew that it can be done. Awesome Bro

'An0ny - October 5, 2014, 6:59 am

Anyone able to get this setup for some cash? I have the server ready.

The project is coded in C#.

+Cyb3r - October 13, 2014, 3:07 am

Is this still working?

I started the exe file and it says time out dunno why, and i cannot download from the first link always takes me to the home page.

Aeonhack Archivist - October 13, 2014, 9:16 am

(Oct 13, 2014 03:07 AM)Unkn0wnRT Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Is this still working?

I started the exe file and it says time out dunno why, and i cannot download from the first link always takes me to the home page.

Yea it's still working...Why not just grab the source and compile it yourself?

<https://litecode.codeplex.com/>

+Cyb3r - October 14, 2014, 11:59 am

(Oct 13, 2014 09:16 AM)alecn1519 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yea it's still working...Why not just grab the source and compile it yourself?

<https://litecode.codeplex.com/>

Because i'm a newbish lol

sorry had to ask becuase i downloaded the compiled exe not the project ;(, anyway what i need to edit is just the Client right? and how can i upload my classes to the server? i have my own host can i upload to it or i have to upload to specific server?

Thanks in advance.

DragonHunter - October 14, 2014, 12:09 pm

(Oct 14, 2014 11:59 AM)Unkn0wnRT Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Because i'm a newbish lol sorry had to ask becuase i downloaded the compiled exe not the project ;(, anyway what i need to edit is just the Client right? and how can i upload my classes to the server? i have my own host can i upload to it or i have to upload to specific server?

Thanks for advance.You're better off using this instead

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/SecureSocketProtocol> as I've moved to github sometime ago

LiteCode is being builtin so it should be rather easy to implement, just look at the example projects server/client

+Cyb3r - October 14, 2014, 3:26 pm

(Oct 14, 2014 12:09 PM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're better off using this instead

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/SecureSocketProtocol> as I've moved to github sometime ago

LiteCode is being builtin so it should be rather easy to implement, just look at the example projects server/client

Since you answered i could ask you some qustions if i may, cause i tried PM you and it says after 25 posts, so i'll post it here, well i'm a ps3 modder and i spend alot of time finding addresses for online and offline mods, and i have to make tools for it and release to public, so everytime my tools get cracked and leached everywhere while i worked hard on it, the only thing i need to hide is uint offsets what's the best way to do that? I'm not a pro programer i'm just learning, and i started learning Qt from yasterday just for those skids -_- , any help will be appreciated, Thanks for your reply.

BaSs_HaXoR - October 17, 2014, 7:00 pm

Nice post man. Great job!

I actually thought of something similar to this, but not as in depth. Great work!

<3 Open Source! Your AWESOME!

+Cyb3r - October 17, 2014, 7:04 pm

I get error loading SecureSocketProtocol2.dll can't find it.

BaSs_HaXoR - October 19, 2014, 4:14 pm

(Oct 14, 2014 12:09 PM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're better off using this instead

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/SecureSocketProtocol> as I've moved to github sometime ago

LiteCode is being builtin so it should be rather easy to implement, just look at the example projects server/client

Yo man, I've been trying to get this for the past 2 days. Could you give me a hand possibly. I have looked at your example projects, and they arn't very well explained nor is their a source to test. :|

BaSs_HaXoR - October 22, 2014, 5:18 pm

(Oct 14, 2014 12:09 PM)DragonHunter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're better off using this instead

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/SecureSocketProtocol> as I've moved to github sometime ago

LiteCode is being builtin so it should be rather easy to implement, just look at the example projects server/clientAwesome man. I looked into SecureSocketProtocol, thanks. :)

I got it working. ?

?

DragonHunter - October 24, 2014, 12:24 pm

(Oct 22, 2014 05:18 PM)BaSs_HaXoR Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Awesome man. I looked into

SecureSocketProtocol, thanks. :)

I got it working. ?

?Good to hear it worked out in the end ?

NotYourNormalApproach - April 20, 2015, 2:06 am

Hey DragonHunter.

I am wondering if this (LiteCode) is able to work together with SSP3? As I can see it was made with SSP2.

DragonHunter - April 20, 2015, 9:23 am

(Apr 20, 2015 02:06 AM)Vecx Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hey DragonHunter.

I am wondering if this (LiteCode) is able to work together with SSP3? As I can see it was made with SSP2. Sure, the only thing you need to do is copying all the messages (packets) & Litecode related stuff to your project from SSP2 ?

DragonHunter - May 3, 2015, 9:58 am

Ok so, like Vecx wanted it for SSP3, I took the time to port LiteCode to be compatible with SSP3
You're able to grab it from here: <https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/tree/SSP3>

The only project you really need is "LiteCode", it's now using a OperationalSocket to be compatible with SSP3

mundi_86 - May 4, 2015, 8:10 am

thank you for this :)

great to see new code from you

DragonHunter - May 9, 2015, 4:44 pm

I updated SSP3 on github, forgot to commit this for the LiteCode port work ?

SIM-1809171 - July 16, 2015, 4:56 am

Posting to return. Looks great.

Cheers

ytgmtvly - July 16, 2015, 4:59 am

Thank you for this man :).

DragonHunter - October 18, 2015, 3:09 am

Just fixed a memory issue, this issue will mostly occur on the server side

The bug will occur when too many people connected to the server

Commit:

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/0cf011b9fc2e907b9645b3649b560daeba4cbf2e>

Fixed a server sided memory issue where it could use Gigabytes of RAM

Fixed sample project

Previous commits

Commit:

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/db87ca7cf6820c0f0d718ded89956235cc31f75f>

Improved stability quite a bit for the SharedClass

Fixed a strange issue with calling the wrong method suddenly

Commit:

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/1f4ab466aa785bfe2dad97896a970a5a05897410>

LiteCode is once again compatible with SSP3 again

Trying to give more performance when calling a method with FastDelegate

Commit:

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/891aa655a257136780ac43294fae5d0db87eb8a1>

Calling remote methods is cleaner

Commit:

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/32f44dfff489083ab35e3a98b5f04f298f21c95c>

When reconnecting to a server which has been updated could cause problems, this patch should fix that

Marwix - October 18, 2015, 8:29 am

Is that similar to connecting a client to a TCP based server with an encryption class which encrypts the traffic?

Aristocles - October 18, 2015, 9:18 am

(Oct 18, 2015 08:29 AM)Keiko Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Is that similar to connecting a client to a TCP based server with an encryption class which encrypts the traffic?

this is very similar to what you already have ?

Marwix - October 18, 2015, 10:45 am

(Oct 18, 2015 09:18 AM).NETGuard Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) this is very similar to what you already have ?

Ah alright sweet ?

DragonHunter - January 30, 2016, 6:06 am

Haven't made a real update in a while except for keeping it compatible with the updates SSP3 are getting

So I finally gone ahead and made a few performance improvement changes

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/90ff9ff49680230ca16b484ec54784f9255054bd>

Improved performance by ~400 method calls a second by moving from BinaryFormatter to Protobuf

So from now on LiteCode will be using Protobuf, keep in mind that if you created classes with [Serializable], this wouldn't be enough

You'd need to use ProtoContract and ProtoMember attributes

Added HookAttribute -

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/LiteCode/commit/a17b2a85e80b304709be1e7697724e31e1f99756>

The HookAttribute will give you power of hooking specific methods at/from server side, this is handy for profiling, debugging, watch how much traffic multiple methods use

There is a sample hook that comes with it "DebugHook" which will output this in the console

Code Method: DelegateTest, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 0Bytes, Arguments (1):

[0] - SampleLib.DelegateTestCallback

Method: CallTest, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 56Bytes, Arguments (1):

[0] - Some Message

Method: CallTest, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 56Bytes, Arguments (1):

[0] - System.Int32[]

Method: CallTest, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 56Bytes, Arguments (1):
[0] - 1234

Method: IntegerTest, Return Value: 661173771, Traffic Used: 62Bytes, Arguments (0)

Method: SecretShit, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 56Bytes, Arguments (0)

Method: SendByteArray, Return Value: NULL, Traffic Used: 0Bytes, Arguments (1):
[0] - System.Byte[]

Method: StringTest, Return Value: test, Traffic Used: 62Bytes, Arguments (0)

Baitable - October 24, 2016, 6:18 am

I seem to be missing the SecureServerProtocol3 reference, and ssp.codeplex.com is down, anyone else have it?

Zippy™ - October 24, 2016, 12:39 pm

(Jul 7, 2012 10:23 AM)dreamer66 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Although it's a good idea in theory (and possibly one of the best anti-cracking techniques up to this date) you do realise how many people have issues with this kind of licence systems right ? :p

A software that requires internet for pretty much all the core functions will probably lose a lot of credibility and possible buyers just of "DRM".

True that, software that requires internet to be functional isn't really attractive if it can be used offline and is also usefull then. But for application that requires a internet connection anyways this is a good solution.

debug - October 24, 2016, 4:17 pm

(Oct 24, 2016 06:18 AM)Baitable Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I seem to be missing the SecureServerProtocol3 reference, and ssp.codeplex.com is down, anyone else have it?

<https://github.com/AnguisCaptor/SecureSocketProtocol>

Ninja - October 24, 2016, 6:50 pm

(Oct 24, 2016 06:18 AM)Baitable Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) SecureServerProtocol3

...

CoderEX - October 24, 2016, 8:23 pm

(Oct 24, 2016 06:50 PM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ...

LOL...