Redmine - Feature #5728

Parent task field should be made available as filter in the issue list

2010-06-22 21:15 - Igor Balk

Status:	Closed		**Start date:**	2010-06-22
Priority:	Normal		**Due date:**	
Assignee:			**% Done:**	0%
Category:	UI		**Estimated time:**	0.00 hour
Target version:				
Resolution:	Duplicate			

Description
Parent task field should be made available as filter in the issue list http://www.redmine.org/wiki/redmine/UXTeamMeeting1 #2

Related issues:		
Is duplicate of Redmine - Feature #6118: Filter by parent task or subtasks	**Closed**	**2010-08-12**

History

#1 - 2010-06-22 22:27 - Yuki Kita

- Status changed from New to Resolved

This issue seems to be a duplicate of #5196.
And the feature had already been implemented in r3618

#2 - 2010-06-23 00:27 - Felix Schäfer

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed

- Resolution set to Duplicate

#3 - 2010-07-20 13:52 - David Marín Carreño

- Status changed from Closed to Reopened

Sorry, but using 1.0.0 I cannot see the way of filtering the issue list, so I only can see the issues that are subtasks of a given task.

#4 - 2010-07-21 09:51 - Sheng Wang

+

#5 - 2010-10-27 20:22 - Sylvain Guimond

I'm using version 1.0.1 and still unable to filter tasks as parent_task is Null

#6 - 2011-10-03 22:12 - Colan Schwartz

This is **not** a duplicate of of #5196, as that issue simply deals with adding the column. This one deals with adding it as a filter. This should be marked as a duplicate of #6118. (This issue is the older one, and would normally have duplicates redirected here, but most of the discussion is already there.)

#7 - 2011-10-03 22:30 - Mischa The Evil

- Status changed from Reopened to Closed

Colan Schwartz wrote:

> This is **not** a duplicate of of #5196, as that issue simply deals with adding the column. This one deals with adding it as a filter.

Agreed. Thanks for your research for this issue.

Colan Schwartz wrote:

> This should be marked as a duplicate of #6118. (This issue is the older one, and would normally have duplicates redirected here, but most of the discussion is already there.)

I've removed the relation to [#5196](#) and added a new one for [#6118](#), and will close this issue.

Note: I'll mention the reference to the UXTeamMeeting1-point on [#6118](#).