

# Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [\[SimpleSeal.net\] Easy to use HWID licensing system >> Web Panel | API Access <<](#)

**SimpleSeal** - July 3, 2017, 9:10 am

Hello all!

I am happy to say that a new HWID licensing system is available for use. SimpleSeal.net is a licensing system built for .NET applications. We make it easy to secure your product with user accounts and HWID authentication.

Available Features:Manual license ban

Automatic ban (1 HWID per license)

2 Applications w/ 10 licenses free

Complete web based admin panel (All web based)

Encrypted DLL & user information

Server sided variables

Cloud based processing for login & register

User customisable login & register form

Full access to the API

Full documentation

Fully commented sample projects (C# & VB.NET)

Friendly support (Discord & Email)

License Levels

Customisable license expiration times

Accessible user data (access username, license information etc on the client)

No website ads!

Planned Features:Change number of HWID per license

Automatic license ban after x number of IP changes

Premade login and registration forms

I would love to here what features you would like to be added!

Check out the panel & try it out for free: [simpleseal.net](http://simpleseal.net)  
Documentation: [simpleseal.net/docs](http://simpleseal.net/docs)

**JUSTIN** - July 3, 2017, 10:43 am

Out of curiosity, why'd you make a new HF account to post this? :o

Edit: Anyway, looks cool. I like the design of the website. :P Might try it out later today.

**B?ker** - July 3, 2017, 10:48 am

(Jul 3, 2017 10:43 AM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Out of curiosity, why'd you make a new HF account to post this? :o

Edit: Anyway, looks cool. I like the design of the website. :P Might try it out later today.

Good point lol, but def looks good

**SimpleSeal** - July 3, 2017, 10:53 am

(Jul 3, 2017 10:43 AM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Out of curiosity, why'd you make a new HF account to post this? :o

Edit: Anyway, looks cool. I like the design of the website. :P Might try it out later today.

(Jul 3, 2017 10:48 AM)?MrDark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Good point lol, but def looks good

My old account had nothing on, i just lurk and never post. I figured for the release of this i would have the account be SimpleSeal for everything

**B?ker** - July 3, 2017, 10:55 am

(Jul 3, 2017 10:53 AM)SimpleSeal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) My old account had nothing on, i just lurk and never post. I figured for the release of this i would have the account be SimpleSeal for everything

Pretty sure that's not aloud. I'd pm staff just to see tho Incase

**SimpleSeal** - July 3, 2017, 11:02 am

(Jul 3, 2017 10:55 AM)?MrDark Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Pretty sure that's not aloud. I'd pm staff just to see tho Incase

:/ Just messaged them. Thanks for the heads up.

**StaPol** - July 3, 2017, 3:47 pm

(Jul 3, 2017 09:10 AM)SimpleSeal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hello all!

I am happy to say that a new HWID licensing system is available for use. SimpleSeal.net is a licensing system built for .NET applications. We make it easy to secure your product with user accounts and HIWD authentication.

Available Features:Manual license ban

Automatic ban (1 HWID per license)

2 Applications w/ 10 licenses free

Complete web based admin panel (All web based)

Encrypted DLL & user information

Server sided variables

Cloud based processing for login & register

User customisable login & register form

Full access to the API

Full documentation

Fully commented sample projects (C# & VB.NET)

Friendly support (Discord & Email)

License Levels

Customisable license expiration times

Accessible user data (access username, license information etc on the client)

No website ads!

Planned Features: Change number of HWID per license

Automatic license ban after x number of IP changes

Premade login and registration forms

I would love to here what features you would like to be added!

Check out the panel & try it out for free: [simpleseal.net](https://simpleseal.net)

Documentation: [simpleseal.net/docs](https://simpleseal.net/docs)

"License Creator" does not create keys ... nothing happens.

Edit: Sorry, my mistake

**Barret** - July 4, 2017, 6:24 am

Another clone? my god...."seal" becomes the new thing around here it seems :P

**VmX5** - July 4, 2017, 6:32 am

(Jul 4, 2017 06:24 AM)Barret Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Another clone? my god...."seal" becomes the new thing around here it seems :P

Haha I was thinking the same thing, the word "seal" has now gotten very repetitive and annoying.

**Barret** - July 4, 2017, 6:36 am

(Jul 4, 2017 06:32 AM)VmX5 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Haha I was thinking the same thing, the word "seal" has now gotten very repetitive and annoying.

Luckily we know better ?

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 7:06 am

(Jul 3, 2017 11:02 AM)SimpleSeal Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ./ Just messaged them. Thanks for the heads up. Well that sure backfired, didn't it?

**VmX5** - July 4, 2017, 7:37 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:06 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well that sure backfired, didn't it?

Lmao, OP should have seen it coming.

**JJBilling** - July 4, 2017, 7:51 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:06 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well that sure backfired, didn't it?

(Jul 4, 2017 07:37 AM)VmX5 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Lmao, OP should have seen it coming.

LOL, this is my original account. All i wanted was to have the same username for all my accounts. :(

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 7:55 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:51 AM)JJBilling Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) LOL, this is my original account. All i wanted was to have the same username for all my accounts. :(

Admitting to multi accounting is not the best idea.

**JJBilling** - July 4, 2017, 7:58 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:55 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Admitting to multi accounting is not the best idea.

I didnt even know it was a rule, but i know know.

**Gluteus Maximus** - July 4, 2017, 7:59 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:55 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Admitting to multi accounting is not the best idea.

He was unaware of the rules I think. OP if you want to just change your username, you can upgrade to L33T and do that. Amazing system BTW!

**JJBilling** - July 4, 2017, 8:00 am

(Jul 4, 2017 07:59 AM)Gluteus Maximus Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He was unaware of the rules I think. OP if you want to just change your username, you can upgrade to L33T and do that. Amazing system BTW!

Ill have to check that out, thought that was reputation based. Thanks for the kind words.

**Blue Eyes** - July 4, 2017, 8:40 am

System license too bad 3 sec for bypass any application under se licensing system !!!

note : 1/10 Just one point for the panel

**JJBilling** - July 4, 2017, 8:53 am

(Jul 4, 2017 08:40 AM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) System license too bad 3 sec for bypass any application under se licensing system !!!

note : 1/10 Just one point for the panel

Hello, I would love for you to let me know how you cracked the system. I want to improve SimpleSeal to be the best it can be so please drop me a email or message me on here or on discord, thanks.

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 8:56 am

(Jul 4, 2017 08:40 AM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) System license too bad 3 sec for bypass any application under se licensing system !!!

note : 1/10 Just one point for the panel

Its a licensing system, not an anti-crack system. It does as advertised; licensing.

(Jul 4, 2017 08:00 AM)JJBilling Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Ill have to check that out, thought that was reputation based. Thanks for the kind words.

There are a lot of things you don't seem to know. I suggest using the Help documents next time.

(Jul 4, 2017 07:59 AM)Gluteus Maximus Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He was unaware of the rules I think. OP if you want to just change your username, you can upgrade to L33T and do that. Amazing system BTW!

He just got banned on one account for multi accounting and then proceeds to mention he is multi accounting on the non-banned account... That's not smart.

**Blue Eyes** - July 4, 2017, 9:13 am

(Jul 4, 2017 08:56 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Its a licensing system, not an anti-crack system. It does as advertised; licensing.

There are a lot of things you don't seem to know. I suggest using the Help documents next time.

He just got banned on one account for multi accounting and then proceeds to mention he is multi accounting on the non-banned account... That's not smart.

I'm not stupid !!!

I did not modify the executable or even the Dll I can make sure the answer is still valid !  
I talked about the license system itself !!!

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 9:15 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:13 AM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm not stupid !!!

I did not modify the executable or even the Dll I can make sure the answer is still valid !  
I talked about the license system itself !!!

Why the excessive use of exclamation marks?

**Blue Eyes** - July 4, 2017, 9:19 am

sorry but i do it each time

**French Products** - July 4, 2017, 9:22 am

(Jul 4, 2017 08:56 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Its a licensing system, not an anti-crack system. It does as advertised; licensing.

Serously..... Who the fuck would use a licensing system for getting RE??????  
A licensing system is used for secure your application in first against sharing and second against RE. Obfuscation is needed a job of course but people are using ConfuserEx so easy to deobfuscate.... Next time don't do shit posting like that ?

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 9:23 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:22 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Serously..... Who the fuck would use a licensing system for getting RE??????

I have no idea what you mean by this, but the dude said he cracked it in 3 seconds, and I am saying licensing is not the same as anti-crack.

**French Products** - July 4, 2017, 9:31 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:23 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I have no idea what you mean by this, but the dude said he cracked it in 3 seconds, and I am saying licensing is not the same as anti-crack.

You're doing coding since 4 years and you've no idea how to protect your work? Dude do you know what is a cloud variable with unique encryption? Do you know what is a checksum protection? Do you know what is an anti debugger function? Well... Blue Eyes is doing a licensing system that

experimented RE guy can't even reverse without obfuscation... Please if you've not idea of what you're talking about don't reply here...

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 9:32 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:31 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're doing coding since 4 years and you've no idea how to protect your work? Dude do you know what is a cloud variable with unique encryption? Do you know what is a checksum protection? Do you need what is an anti debugger function? Well... Blue Eyes is doing a licensing system that experimented RE guy can't even reverse without obfuscation... Please if you've not idea of what you're talking about don't reply here...

When did I say I don't know how to protect my work?

Are you retarded or something? All I said was a LICENSING SYSTEM is not the same as PREVENTING CRACKING.

**French Products** - July 4, 2017, 9:36 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:32 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) When did I say I don't know how to protect my work?

Are you retarded or something? All I said was a LICENSING SYSTEM is not the same as PREVENTING CRACKING.

If someone use a licensing system IT'S AGAINST SHARING. CRACK = SHARING ON BOARDS AND SHIT. Who the heck would use a licensing system without protections????

**Hell** - July 4, 2017, 9:39 am

This thread will give all of you some clarity : <https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5648230>

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 9:52 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:36 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Who the heck would use a licensing system without protections????

No one, but that is completely irrelevant here.

They are 2 separate things.

(Jul 4, 2017 09:36 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) CRACK = SHARING ON BOARDS AND SHIT.

No it isn't. That is leaking. Cracking is gaining access to the features without authorizing with the licensing system.

**+Haze** - July 4, 2017, 10:42 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:22 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Serously..... Who the fuck would use a licensing system for getting RE??????

A licensing system is used for secure your application in first against sharing and second against RE. Obfuscation is needed a job of course but people are using ConfuserEx so easy to deobfuscate.... Next time don't do shit posting like that ?

(Jul 4, 2017 09:31 AM)French Products Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're doing coding since 4 years and you've no idea how to protect your work? Dude do you know what is a cloud variable with unique encryption? Do you know what is a checksum protection? Do you know what is an anti debugger function? Well... Blue Eyes is doing a licensing system that experimented RE guy can't even reverse without obfuscation... Please if you've not idea of what you're talking about don't reply here...

Why are you so angry, calm down dude. You act as if you've just learnt what encryption is the other day, so don't come here on your high horses.

Also, it's not the job of a licensing system to protect ones application from reverse engineering,

that's silly.

**JBilling** - July 4, 2017, 10:49 am

(Jul 4, 2017 09:13 AM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm not stupid !!!

I did not modify the executable or even the Dll I can make sure the answer is still valid !

I talked about the license system itself !!!

Not to be rude or anything but your account has 1 application with no licenses being created, so i am not sure how you managed to login to a application using the DLL.

AFIK you cant fake a valid login response that the API gives with the connection being HTTPS, if i am wrong please correct me.

I just had a look on fiddler and couldn't manage to fake a correct login response. If you would be so kind to share your method i would be very grateful.

**Blue Eyes** - July 4, 2017, 12:04 pm

Even with the https it and possible to do a fake connection

I redirect the requests to another server !

**cawkre** - July 4, 2017, 12:19 pm

its looks nice however what blue eyes was saying is that you can bypass the login screen without the need of touching the app using the licensing system

for example you can have all the protection in the world on your app but all you need to do is edit the dll and it works

if you want me to send you the dll to show you what i mean (this is to the dev) pm me and i will send it you

**JBilling** - July 4, 2017, 1:02 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 12:19 PM)danny1313 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) its looks nice however what blue eyes was saying is that you can bypass the login screen without the need of touching the app using the licensing system

for example you can have all the protection in the world on your app but all you need to do is edit the dll and it works

if you want me to send you the dll to show you what i mean (this is to the dev) pm me and i will send it you

Hello, i cant PM but can you message me on discord. Link is on the website. Thanks for the help.

**Freezo4** - July 4, 2017, 1:13 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 12:04 PM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Even with the https it and possible to do a fake connection

I redirect the requests to another server !

Please, stop it, If it has a Free Plan then I don't mind to use it even if you "can" bypass it in 3 sec ( omg 3 sec please the Bs ... )

What I'm seeing here is just hate from you, cuz you didn't provide a proof.

**EagleEye** - July 4, 2017, 2:13 pm

you have a big logical bug

pm me for more details

**Tronsmart** - July 4, 2017, 2:39 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 02:13 PM)961Group Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) you have a big logical bug

pm me for more details

Op account looks closed

**sdk** - July 4, 2017, 4:01 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 08:56 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Its a licensing system, not an anti-crack system. It does as advertised; licensing.

If you lock the doors but not the windows are you still safe?

**+Haze** - July 4, 2017, 4:16 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 04:01 PM)sdk? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you lock the doors but not the windows are you still safe?

Exactly, you just proved his point.

**sdk** - July 4, 2017, 4:23 pm

I see a lot of "this is licensing protection is diff", protection on his system should be there, but it seems not to be. If you can bypass with spoofing requests something needs to be done, I understand the whole it wont magically protect your app if you don't. But its a 2 way street, needs to be done on both ends, obfuscated DLLs, encrypted API responses etc. Users need to obfuscate their stuff too.

To op

If you're here still try to create your own encryption / encoding for responses and requests.

**Ninja** - July 4, 2017, 6:09 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 04:23 PM)sdk? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you can bypass with spoofing requests something needs to be done, I understand the whole it wont magically protect your app if you don't. But its a 2 way street, needs to be done on both ends, obfuscated DLLs, encrypted API responses etc.

Licensing is licensing. If you can bypass it is irrelevant. It does what it does; license.

**sdk** - July 4, 2017, 7:25 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 06:09 PM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Licensing is licensing. If you can bypass it is irrelevant. It does what it does; license.

If you bypass an authentication service, your tool / program / service is cracked, if it's easily reproduced user can run the bypass and access the tool without buying it as Blue Eyes was trying to point out....

**Ninja** - July 5, 2017, 4:28 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 07:25 PM)sdk? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you bypass an authentication service, your tool / program / service is cracked, if it's easily reproduced user can run the bypass and access the tool without buying it as Blue Eyes was trying to point out....

The point is not that it is bypassable or crackable. The point is; it licenses. That is what it is advertised as. Not as anti-crack, or that it is uncrackable. Just licensing.

**sdk** - July 5, 2017, 4:36 pm

(Jul 5, 2017 04:28 PM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The point is not that it is bypassable or crackable. The

point is; it licenses. That is what it is advertised as. Not as anti-crack, or that it is uncrackable. Just licensing.

Yes, I get that, but its important the licensing itself can be bypassed, not the programming it isn't feasible because in turn it wouldn't be doing its job.

**Ninja** - July 6, 2017, 4:53 pm

(Jul 5, 2017 04:36 PM)sdk? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes, I get that, but its important the licensing itself can be bypassed, not the programming it isn't feasible because in turn it wouldn't be doing its job.

Of course that is important, and that should be achieved using external tools such as obfuscators, not built in. Things like end to end encryption are of course nice and stuff, but not required to 'qualify' as a licensing system.

**JUSTIN** - July 6, 2017, 6:59 pm

(Jul 4, 2017 07:25 PM)sdk? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you bypass an authentication service, your tool / program / service is cracked, if it's easily reproduced user can run the bypass and access the tool without buying it as Blue Eyes was trying to point out....

Not necessarily, there are ways to get programs to simply stop working if the licensing is removed. I think the dev of NetGuard discussed this in another thread.

**shiroze** - July 6, 2017, 8:11 pm

can't open the website the server is not found... any one ?

**CoderEX** - July 6, 2017, 9:07 pm

(Jul 6, 2017 06:59 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not necessarily, there are ways to get programs to simply stop working if the licensing is removed. I think the dev of NetGuard discussed this in another thread.

The idea is incorporating server side variables and multiple login requirements throughout the application.

So for example, if a user wants to use a function have it require that it has the proper server side variable, or send a login check function; if it returns valid then run the function, if it does not then quit application.

Though, that is the gist of it. There are more advanced ways to implement it.

**JUSTIN** - July 6, 2017, 11:12 pm

(Jul 6, 2017 09:07 PM)CoderEX Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The idea is incorporating server side variables and multiple login requirements throughout the application.

So for example, if a user wants to use a function have it require that it has the proper server side variable, or send a login check function; if it returns valid then run the function, if it does not then quit application.

Though, that is the gist of it. There are more advanced ways to implement it.

Well yeah I know what it is, it's implemented in all of my personal licensing systems, I was just letting sdk know that you can at least prevent a program from functioning (for example, get the server side variables required for the program to work in the login request) so it wont be cracked/leaked as easily if the licensing is bypassed.

The "multiple login requests" idea seems pretty pointless to me though, if they can bypass the licensing initially I don't see why they couldn't do it again while the program is running.

**stefsot** - July 6, 2017, 11:33 pm

(Jul 5, 2017 04:28 PM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The point is not that it is bypassable or crackable. The point is; it licenses. That is what it is advertised as. Not as anti-crack, or that it is uncrackable. Just licensing.

a licensing system that can be spoofed so easily is more than useless  
https is available everywhere currently

simply verifying the certificate is more than enough to prevent spoofing and you don't need to be rocket scientist to implement it

a licensing system without basic security is pointless and useless

**CoderEX** - July 7, 2017, 12:49 am

(Jul 6, 2017 11:12 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well yeah I know what it is, it's implemented in all of my personal licensing systems, I was just letting sdk know that you can at least prevent a program from functioning (for example, get the server side variables required for the program to work in the login request) so it wont be cracked/leaked as easily if the licensing is bypassed.

The "multiple login requests" idea seems pretty pointless to me though, if they can bypass the licensing initially I don't see why they couldn't do it again while the program is running.

I apologize for the miscommunication; I was only elaborating on the statement you made.

Also, the multiple login requests was meant for licensing system(s) that include server side functions.

**Ninja** - July 7, 2017, 6:13 am

(Jul 6, 2017 11:33 PM)stefsot Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) a licensing system that can be spoofed so easily is more than useless

https is available everywhere currently

simply verifying the certificate is more than enough to prevent spoofing and you don't need to be rocket scientist to implement it

a licensing system without basic security is pointless and useless  
Useless or not, it does what it is advertised as; licensing.

Damn, people are so dense.

**Aristocles** - July 7, 2017, 6:15 am

(Jul 7, 2017 06:13 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Useless or not, it does what it is advertised as; licensing.

Damn, people are so dense.

they are wannabe hacker that's why, 6 pages of useless debate, ruining the possible sales, good job ppl, next time listen to ninja

**Ninja** - July 7, 2017, 8:11 am

(Jul 7, 2017 06:15 AM)Martin Heidegger Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) they are wannabe hacker that's why, 6 pages of useless debate, ruining the possible sales, good job ppl, next time listen to ninja  
10 posts per page in 2017. smh

**JUSTIN** - July 7, 2017, 7:10 pm

(Jul 7, 2017 06:15 AM)Martin Heidegger Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) they are wannabe hacker that's why, 6 pages of useless debate, ruining the possible sales, good job ppl, next time listen to ninja  
... even NetGuard is useless if the licensing can be bypassed with such ease. Why deob a program

to REMOVE licensing when you can just redirect the request?

**Ninja** - July 8, 2017, 5:57 am

(Jul 7, 2017 07:10 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ... even NetGuard is useless if the licensing can be bypassed with such ease. Why deob a program to REMOVE licensing when you can just redirect the request?

But if they use end to end encryption?

**Aristocles** - July 8, 2017, 1:42 pm

(Jul 7, 2017 07:10 PM)JUSTIN Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ... even NetGuard is useless if the licensing can be bypassed with such ease. Why deob a program to REMOVE licensing when you can just redirect the request?

i never stated obfuscation is an anti crack solution, read my latest thread where i details how to move your code on a server, this is the only reliable anti cracking solution, the rest is fake news.

this is about licensing a program or application, not about anti cracking, so please gentlemen stop off topic

**sdk** - July 8, 2017, 2:30 pm

(Jul 8, 2017 05:57 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) But if they use end to end encryption?Yes, thank you for seeing what we are trying to say... There is no end to end implemented from what the guy said,

**stefsot** - July 9, 2017, 4:34 am

Half the people here have no clue what they are talking about.

This is 2017, there should be no excuse for not having having basic security.

I guess if your credentials get stolen through man in the middle attack, you shouldn't blame the website for not using https but the attacker, it is after all a website not a security program.

**Ninja** - July 9, 2017, 7:21 am

(Jul 9, 2017 04:34 AM)stefsot Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Half the people here have no clue what they are talking about.

This is 2017, there should be no excuse for not having having basic security.

There shouldn't be an excuse.

This is a licensing system. It is advertised as a licensing system. Poor security or not, it is a licensing system. By your logic a car is no longer a car if the lock is broken.

Please tell me, how this is NOT a licensing system. And if you have a valid argument as to WHY this system does NOT fit in the category licensing systems I will shut my mouth.

**ubbelol** - July 9, 2017, 2:48 pm

(Jul 9, 2017 07:21 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Please tell me, how this is NOT a licensing system. And if you have a valid argument as to WHY this system does NOT fit in the category licensing systems I will shut my mouth.

Where in his post do you see him claim that it's not a licensing system? He simply implied that a .NET licensing system without adequate or even basic security is mostly useless from the customer's point of view which is a fair point.

(Jul 9, 2017 07:21 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) By your logic a car is no longer a car if the lock is broken. No? By his logic it would still be a car, but a shitty one that people shouldn't purchase.

**Ninja** - July 10, 2017, 9:48 am

(Jul 9, 2017 02:48 PM)ubbelol Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Where in his post do you see him claim that it's not a

licensing system? He simply implied that a .NET licensing system without adequate or even basic security is mostly useless from the customer's point of view which is a fair point.

No? By his logic it would still be a car, but a shitty one that people shouldn't purchase.

The deal is that some people take it too far and say it is the worst they have ever seen because it can be cracked easily. Even NetSeal was 'cracked' easily, by usually just removing 1 line of code. Poorly protected or not, this is still a licensing system. And people rated it too poorly because of its weak protection.

I also got offended by this:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5661065&pid=55262813#pid55262813>

And the following post of the dude.

And the whole subject got taken way out of context. I keep getting misunderstood when all I say is "this is a licensing system. it licenses applications". I never said it wasn't poorly protected yet people continue arguing and taking what I say out of context.

**Blue Eyes** - July 10, 2017, 10:12 am

Yes, netstal we could if we removed a line to the program, but the untouched to the dll, exe on little crack it is not the same thing !

**Ninja** - July 10, 2017, 10:40 am

(Jul 10, 2017 10:12 AM)Blue Eyes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) but the untouched to the dll, exe on little crack it is not the same thing !

I have no idea what you just said.

**cawkre** - July 11, 2017, 10:31 am

(Jul 10, 2017 09:48 AM)Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The deal is that some people take it too far and say it is the worst they have ever seen because it can be cracked easily. Even NetSeal was 'cracked' easily, by usually just removing 1 line of code. Poorly protected or not, this is still a licensing system. And people rated it too poorly because of its weak protection.

I also got offended by this:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=5661065&pid=55262813#pid55262813>

And the following post of the dude.

And the whole subject got taken way out of context. I keep getting misunderstood when all I say is "this is a licensing system. it licenses applications". I never said it wasn't poorly protected yet people continue arguing and taking what I say out of context.

i agree with what you said about netseal in a way

yes netseal could be removed from the users program by removing the call to netseal but if you couldnt unpack the file you had a much harder time

netseal itself had some very clever integrity checks meaning if you edited the licenseSE (i think thats what its name was) the file would redownload itself due to a hash check now yes this hash was from online so you could spoof it

however the call to this check was in the users application (however we are pretending we cant unpack the users app at all )

so now lets say we spoof the hash using fiddler you still need to make some sort of modification in the licenseSE file to actually bypass the login now this is where the second and the most annoying check came in, from the users application it did a check to a method in the mscorlib.dll and this you cant patch the mscorlib.dll to always return true because this could cause some serious issues so you have to look for another way around it (in my case i made a loader to do this )

but as you see i may of made it sound much easier than it was but it was a difficult job to actually do and this is what the top licensing system should be able to do make it difficult for the backend to be cracked (by backend i mean there dlls)

my information could be slightly incorrect about netseal as when i did this was a very long time ago

**ubbelol** - July 11, 2017, 12:06 pm

(Jul 11, 2017 10:31 AM)danny1313 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) i agree with what you said about netseal in a way

yes netseal could be removed from the users program by removing the call to netseal but if you couldnt unpack the file you had a much harder time

netseal itself had some very clever integrity checks meaning if you edited the licenseSE (i think thats what its name was) the file would redownload itself due to a hash check now yes this hash was from online so you could spoof it

however the call to this check was in the users application (however we are pretending we cant unpack the users app at all )

so now lets say we spoof the hash using fiddler you still need to make some sort of modification in the licenseSE file to actually bypass the login now this is where the second and the most annoying check came in, from the users application it did a check to a method in the mscorlib.dll and this you cant patch the mscorlib.dll to always return true because this could cause some serious issues so you have to look for another way around it (in my case i made a loader to do this )

but as you see i may of made it sound much easier than it was but it was a difficult job to actually do and this is what the top licensing system should be able to do make it difficult for the backend to be cracked (by backend i mean there dlls)

my information could be slightly incorrect about netseal as when i did this was a very long time ago The LicenseSE file was actually the one thing that made NetSeal really vulnerable. Since it always relied on it for all core security functions and it was easily patched it meant you could crack any NetSeal application regardless of how well the users application was protected by simply modifying the LicenseSE assembly.

**stefsot** - July 12, 2017, 3:56 am

(Jul 11, 2017 12:06 PM)ubbelol Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The LicenseSE file was actually the one thing that made NetSeal really vulnerable. Since it always relied on it for all core security functions and it was easily patched it meant you could crack any NetSeal application regardless of how well the users application was protected by simply modifying the LicenseSE assembly.

that's why all new licensing systems coming out with a dll are weak and waste of time the dll provides API which is easy as fuck to abuse

**Alpha\_Coder** - July 26, 2017, 6:02 am

its a nice idea but every api system get to top then they get arrested :P

**Ninja** - July 26, 2017, 8:23 am

(Jul 26, 2017 06:02 AM)Alpha\_Coder Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) its a nice idea but every api system get to top then they get arrested :P

Only NetSeal afaik because he actively aided in licensing malware. A licensing system in itself is in no way illegal.

**DarkPumpkin** - August 17, 2017, 12:58 pm

Sellouts everywhere xd

GLWS dude