

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [RAT Section Limitations.](#)

Business - June 7, 2015, 3:41 pm

I know this sort of falls under suggestions that will not be accepted rule #8 but I thought it was worth putting out in the open, as it pertains to member safety. (Rule 8 does not say prestige restrictions)

Spoiler ([Click to View](#)) "Member Restrictions. HF will not be taking suggestions for new restrictions on the site based on post count, registration date, or reputation."

Although they are contributing factors to prestige, it does not rule out prestige in particular.

Members with under a certain amount of prestige should not be able to post links within the RAT section.

More than half the time they are trying to spread their infected links to other HF members.

There is no reason that a new member needs to post "untouched" downloads for certain RATs if there are already tons of them posted by more trusted users.

This change would prevent infection for many members to come.

Jokeh - June 7, 2015, 3:43 pm

This would probably stop some of the new people trying to spread there malware, but could promote spam

Charlemagne - June 7, 2015, 3:43 pm

I agree, this would be very helpful in preventing the infection of members. It is very easy to farm posts, however, so why not have there be a prestige requirement instead.

Rep whore 100 - June 7, 2015, 3:44 pm

Sounds like this would help out that section!

Business - June 7, 2015, 3:44 pm

(Jun 7, 2015 03:43 PM)Charlemagne Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I agree, this would be very helpful in preventing the infection of members. It is very easy to farm posts, however, so why not have there be a prestige requirement instead.

I am open to anything, I just want there to be a limitation to when links can be posted. It could be prestige, posts, I do not care. I just want these infections to reduce in number.

Canonsx130 - June 7, 2015, 6:09 pm

Doesn't this come under rule suggestions which are automatically denied?

Business - June 7, 2015, 6:13 pm

(Jun 7, 2015 06:09 PM)Canonsx130 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Doesn't this come under rule suggestions which are automatically denied?

Yes it does but I think it needs to be at least suggested.

Crab - June 7, 2015, 6:15 pm

+1 to this. Half the time I see members with low posts trying to infect others + provide backdoored RATs in that section.

#Skyline - June 7, 2015, 6:20 pm

I actually do approve of this.

Over my time within the RAT section new members would sign up get 50 posts and away they go. It's like they use the hacking sections as a resource to spread. Fake crypters, spam bots, unheard of RATs, "Trusted download links."

But it's also up to us to realise these concepts of members trying to spread and warn the community and report the thread to staff.

ITryMyBest - June 7, 2015, 6:28 pm

I fully agree with this. This should happen

BahNahNah - June 7, 2015, 6:29 pm

Agree, the RAT section has too many low quality threads from people who dont know how to use the search feature.

Eternal. - June 7, 2015, 6:30 pm

I support this idea, would thin out those who want to quickly spread viruses with no effort.

Pumpkins - June 7, 2015, 6:57 pm

A prestige requirement or something before being allowed to post links is an excellent idea. I fully support this.

FractumSeraph - June 7, 2015, 7:04 pm

The problem is that this would just make more post farming. I can't tell you how many times someone has posted "Thanks bro, helped a lot." or something like "Good tutorial man, I'll bookmark it for later." When the post isn't even a tutorial...

Armada - June 7, 2015, 7:35 pm

(Jun 7, 2015 03:41 PM)?usiness Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) * I know this sort of falls under suggestions that will not be accepted rule #8 but I thought it was worth putting out in the open. (Rule 8 does not say prestige restrictions)*

Members with under a certain amount of prestige should not be able to post links within the RAT section.

More than half the time they are trying to spread their infected links to other HF members.

There is no reason that a new member needs to post "untouched" downloads for certain RATs if there are already tons of them posted by more trusted users.

This change would prevent infection for many members to come.

Frankly I outright support this 100%

Dealing with R.A.T.'s is tricky business to start with, complicating things with members infecting other members, not only is self destructive as a community as a whole, but in general overall stupid.

Your hearts in the right place on this project. I hope the voices get heard ?

Formant - June 8, 2015, 3:49 am

I have seen people complain about this before and the response has always been "don't click links".

The last issue I saw was someone was sent a hyperlink via PM and got infected. I believe the response in that thread was on the fault of the user who clicked the link.

I've never visited the RAT section, but from what I have seen, I think it should have similar posting requirements like the Marketplace. I don't know about making prestige a factor, but positive reputation would make sense.

Business - June 8, 2015, 8:45 am

(Jun 8, 2015 03:49 AM)Formant Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I have seen people complain about this before and the response has always been "don't click links".

The last issue I saw was someone was sent a hyperlink via PM and got infected. I believe the response in that thread was on the fault of the user who clicked the link.

I've never visited the RAT section, but from what I have seen, I think it should have similar posting requirements like the Marketplace. I don't know about making prestige a factor, but positive reputation would make sense.

I had to use prestige as my limitation example as it is not mentioned in the "Suggestions That Will Not Be Accepted" Rule #8 "...post count, registration date, or reputation."

Business - June 8, 2015, 9:17 am

(Jun 8, 2015 08:51 AM)- Sam - Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Why would you disregard the sticky in the first place by making a suggestion which is already denied. ?

If you read it properly, it says:

"Member Restrictions. HF will not be taking suggestions for new restrictions on the site based on post count, registration date, or reputation."

Although they are contributing factors to prestige, it does not rule out prestige in particular.

SIM-2212192 - June 8, 2015, 9:20 am

+1

I think HF should auto-break the link, then post a red warning underneath it (kind of like the one someone gets when their post gets reported.)

Business - June 8, 2015, 9:20 am

(Jun 8, 2015 09:18 AM)- Sam - Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) But you chose to use prestige in your suggestion to bend around the rule. ?

Right, I think this idea implemented in some way would prevent the infection of many members, so I found a way to speak up about it. You are right, it will probably be denied... regardless I wanted to give it a shot.

Troja?Hors? - June 8, 2015, 9:20 am

I agree with this.

Also, if any member was to trust a 'safe download' from a new member, maybe they deserve to get infected due to their stupidity lmaooo

But yes, I think this would be great. Thanks for the suggestion.

Z3r0D4y - June 8, 2015, 10:51 am

I never really noticed this in the RAT section.
Staff seems to take care of it within few hours.

Business - June 8, 2015, 11:38 am

(Jun 8, 2015 10:51 AM)BlackSoft Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I never really noticed this in the RAT section.
Staff seems to take care of it within few hours.
During that few hours several people could become infected.

crazyycast13 - June 8, 2015, 11:59 am

(Jun 8, 2015 11:38 AM)?usiness Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) During that few hours several people could become infected.
Do what I do in the crypto section and directly PM staff if there is an infected link.

I also think this should be in effect for specifically the encryption and decryption forum (not the hashes and ciphers subsection) as there are the occasional crypter.

I also think that new members trying to get around the restriction in those sections should be revoked posting privileges for a day, but I don't think you can suggest that.

+One - June 8, 2015, 3:50 pm

I would have to agree with Sam on this one. It will lose activity. Also, he has a point, do not download something from a member which is not trusted in your eyes, that's why there is a trust scan, reputation system and anything else to check the quality of the person and his trustworthiness. But this idea doesn't hurt anyone either and it will make the section a bit better, but again, it's easy to gain prestige.

Business - June 8, 2015, 3:58 pm

(Jun 8, 2015 03:50 PM)+One Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would have to agree with Sam on this one. It will lose activity. Also, he has a point, do not download something from a member which is not trusted in your eyes, that's why there is a trust scan, reputation system and anything else to check the quality of the person and his trustworthiness. But this idea doesn't hurt anyone either and it will make the section a bit better, but again, it's easy to gain prestige.

The points against the idea are valid, and the idea itself is valid as well. It could go either way, but I am fairly certain it will be denied. Just thought I would give it a try.

+One - June 8, 2015, 3:59 pm

(Jun 8, 2015 03:58 PM)?usiness Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The points against the idea are valid, and the idea itself is valid as well. It could go either way, but I am fairly certain it will be denied. Just thought I would give it a try.

Of course, a suggestion is always a suggestion. If that gives sense. No it doesn't, nevermind then, haha.

Business - June 8, 2015, 4:09 pm

(Jun 8, 2015 03:59 PM)+One Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Of course, a suggestion is always a suggestion. If that gives sense. No it doesn't, nevermind then, haha.

I get what you mean. Never hurts to suggest something. Better to speak the mind than hold silence.

05317832892 - June 9, 2015, 11:23 pm

+1

This is a good idea, however it probably won't get accepted for reasons stated before me. I believe this would really benefit the community. Too many people get infected by 50 posters.

Business - June 10, 2015, 12:06 pm

Another good example of why we need this.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=4858978> (Was taken down hours later)

What are the odds that this multi is just sharing a clean download?

64-Bit - June 10, 2015, 1:02 pm

I think a sticky thread should be made with links to all known safe versions of the most popular free rats.

Obviously a trusted member of the community would be responsible for the integrity of these links and their respected files.

Business - June 10, 2015, 1:03 pm

(Jun 10, 2015 01:02 PM)Poppadomus Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think a sticky thread should be made with links to all known safe versions of the most popular free rats.

Obviously a trusted member of the community would be responsible for the integrity of these links and their respected files. Hack Forums will most likely not directly support a download link uploaded by a member. It could be infected, regardless of your reputation. I just think a limit to new accounts should be in place to prevent infection of members.

Dr Strangelove - June 10, 2015, 2:40 pm

Vouch on this ?

Can't let tards with multis keep posting their shit here.

Business - June 12, 2015, 2:42 pm

Anyone who goes to that section knows that reporting posts does little to nothing and if something does happen it is four hours too late and the multi accounter has already had his fun trolling or infected several members.

PRIME EXAMPLE.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=4861902>

I am not saying that specific post has an infected link, because honestly I am not going to test every download that gets posted.

Most of the time, you will see these download threads go up and then the next day that person has tons of negative rep and there are reports of infections.

Omniscient - June 13, 2015, 12:52 pm

Positive rep and at least 20 posts or upgraded account are now required to post in RAT.

Thanks.