

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Must A Stub Be 100% FUD Before You Can Spread?](#)

jcharelli - June 30, 2016, 11:56 pm

I am just wondering if the stub has to be 100% fud before you can infect a user, Because no crypter is 100% fud from what i have read in the forum. Thanks

NoSuchAgency - June 30, 2016, 11:58 pm

I mean, you can spread a 35/35 detected file, you just won't get anyone with any sort of anti virus.

Not being fud will make you infect less people.

QU?CKSILVER - July 1, 2016, 1:29 am

It's common sense man, the less detections your file has, the better chances of bypassing security software on computers worldwide... You will obviously have no success if it is not undetected.

K3njii - July 1, 2016, 2:34 am

No it doesn't need to be 100% fud.

But as the user said above me the more detections the more of a chance to lose the client.

Hopsin - July 1, 2016, 2:38 am

(Jun 30, 2016 11:56 PM)jcharelli Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am just wondering if the stub has to be 100% fud before you can infect a user, Because no crypter is 100% fud from what i have read in the forum. Thanks

If there is no "proof" of what you read about then how do you make false claims ? Did you test ALL the products available here, I highly doubt it.

K3njii - July 1, 2016, 2:41 am

(Jul 1, 2016 02:38 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If there is no "proof" of what you read about then how do you make false claims ? Did you test ALL the products available here, I highly doubt it.

He said what he read in the forum somewhere is where he got the information.

I'm guessing from other users.

Hopsin - July 1, 2016, 3:07 am

(Jul 1, 2016 02:41 AM)K3njii Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He said what he read in the forum somewhere is where he got the information.

I'm guessing from other users.

Yes I see but spreading false information is not nice. Especially without proof

K3njii - July 1, 2016, 3:10 am

(Jul 1, 2016 03:07 AM)Hopsin Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes I see but spreading false information is not nice. Especially without proof

What he's saying is not necessarily false information. He just made a educated guess based on what other people have said about their crypters.

Hopsin - July 1, 2016, 3:18 am

(Jul 1, 2016 03:10 AM)K3njii Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) What he's saying is not necessarily false information. He

just made a educated guess based on what other people have said about their crypters.

Guesses are okay but spreading false is bad ?... ?

I don't see your logic and I don't want to argue with another HF member.

Have a nice day.

I'll just leave this here

(Jun 30, 2016 11:56 PM)jcharelli Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am just wondering if the stub has to be 100% fud before you can infect a user, Because no crypter is 100% fud from what i have read in the forum.

Thanks

LSDoom - July 1, 2016, 3:19 am

As mentioned, less AV detections means higher success rate. That doesn't mean you won't be able to spread if its detected, it just means you will have a hard time.

A tip I always give when it comes to spreading a non-FUD RAT is, conceal it as something that gets detected by an AV. A CS:GO cheat, cracked RAT, Botnet builder etc. A lot of programs give false positives, use that to your advantage. Also keep in mind that if you are trying to spread something that doesn't give false positive people are going to freak out when it gets detected by their AV, compared to if they expect a false positive.

Just don't spread on HF ;)

AtiPLS - July 1, 2016, 5:53 am

Not need to be fud in any situation, like if u spread as "hack program" then you can mark as false positive.

Mitlar - July 1, 2016, 5:57 am

(Jul 1, 2016 05:53 AM)AtiPLS Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not need to be fud in any situation, like if u spread as "hack program" then you can mark as false positive.

Yes but once they turn on their antivirus the stub will be gone.

DingusMonster - July 1, 2016, 6:17 am

Technically yes you still can spread but likely you'll only get people with weak antis or no antis at all. Having your file at least 80% fud is good

Twixles - July 1, 2016, 7:52 am

You don't need to. I mean when I first started ratting I didn't use a crypter, granted I was stupid, but I got some people. I just had to add "Your antivirus might flag it as a virus, but that's just because bla bla bla". The less detections the more slaves. FUD will obviously give you the most, so it's recommended that you keep your file FUD.

Goldmouth - July 1, 2016, 8:25 am

It doesn't have to be FUD for mass spread, but know that the results wont be the same as FUD working stub. Especially if its native.

_Devil - July 4, 2016, 2:29 am

UD stub with few detection's wont be big problem for you.

Stomedy - July 4, 2016, 12:47 pm

No, you only need to bypass the popular antiviruses.

DingusMonster - July 4, 2016, 12:58 pm

(Jul 4, 2016 12:47 PM)Stomedy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) No, you only need to bypass the popular antiviruses. Yeah, but it is helpful to have it completely FUD

Stomedy - July 4, 2016, 1:28 pm

(Jul 4, 2016 12:58 PM)DingusMonster Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yeah, but it is helpful to have it completely FUD
There is no crypter that is actually fud. Even if you buy a private stub for 100 dollars a month your always gonna have that one antivirus detect it. So yeah it only matters about the most popular ones.

phearz - July 4, 2016, 3:08 pm

be smart because 99% of crypters here are not even 30/35 runtime bypass lol

xLelouch - July 4, 2016, 3:27 pm

It highly depends on the method of your spreading. If you gotta post a virus scan, you will need at least scantime file. Runtime fud will always help you to get many clients.

Danny- - July 4, 2016, 3:30 pm

Ghost crypter currently at 1/36 detections

K3njii - July 4, 2016, 4:19 pm

(Jul 4, 2016 03:30 PM)Danny- Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Ghost crypter currently at 1/36 detections
Ghost crypter doesn't seem like a viable option as many people complain about it not working.

For anybody looking for a crypter I don't recommend ghost crypter.

QU?CKSILVER - July 4, 2016, 5:33 pm

(Jul 4, 2016 04:19 PM)K3njii Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Ghost crypter doesn't seem like a viable option as many people complain about it not working.

For anybody looking for a crypter I don't recommend ghost crypter.
I don't recommend it either. It was a cancer.

K3njii - July 4, 2016, 5:34 pm

(Jul 4, 2016 05:33 PM)DJPunisher Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't recommend it either. It was a cancer.
It is cancer*