

Redmine - Feature #5655

Allow related issues to be started/due on the same date.

2010-06-08 15:26 - Dan Olsen

|   |           |                        |                   |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Status:</b>  | Closed    | <b>Start date:</b>     | 2010-06-08        |
| <b>Priority:</b>  | Normal    | <b>Due date:</b>       |                   |
| <b>Assignee:</b>  |           | <b>% Done:</b>         | 0%                |
| <b>Category:</b>  |           | <b>Estimated time:</b> | 0.00 hour         |
| <b>Target version:</b>  |           |                        |                   |
| <b>Resolution:</b>  | Duplicate |                        |                   |
| <b>Description</b><br>When I have issue A and issue B, and I assign issue B to follow issue A I want to still be able to schedule the start date for both A and B on the same day.<br><br>Currently if I schedule issue A and issue B to start on the same day, than I say issue B follows issue A, issue B's start date is changed to the next day after issue A's due date. Issue A may only take an hour which means issue A and issue B could technically start on the same day.<br><br>Instead of moving the B date out a day after the due date of A, set the start date of B to the due date of A and then let me change the start date of B if it needs to be the next day. |           |                        |                   |
| <b>Related issues:</b>  |           |                        |                   |
| Has duplicate Redmine - Feature #6127: Preceeded by / followed by - Same day  |           | <b>Closed</b>          | <b>2010-08-13</b> |
| Is duplicate of Redmine - Patch #3195: issue's start date could be the latest...  |           | <b>New</b>             | <b>2009-04-17</b> |

History

#1 - 2010-06-29 20:18 - Christopher Lörken

I've encountered the same issue.

I have fixed this for me like this:  
In version 0.9.4 open your app/models/issue\_relation.rb file and go to line 79.

Replace

```
def successor_soonest_start
  return nil unless (TYPE_PRECEDES == self.relation_type) && (issue_from.start_date || issue_from.due_date)
  (issue_from.due_date || issue_from.start_date) + 1 + delay
end

with

def successor_soonest_start
  return nil unless (TYPE_PRECEDES == self.relation_type) && (issue_from.start_date || issue_from.due_date)
  (issue_from.due_date || issue_from.start_date) + delay
end
```

in other words: remove the "+ 1" from line 79.  
Restart your web server and you can choose the same start and enddates for following tasks.

#2 - 2010-08-17 10:23 - Brian DeVries

- File seq\_issues\_start\_end\_same\_day.patch added

As a side note, at least in [r3940](#), this is now on line 94. I've included a patch with this change.

As a question, what would be the general requirements for this feature to be included in Redmine proper? Depending on the complexity, I figure this might be a good introduction to Redmine hacking for me.

#3 - 2010-09-10 02:25 - red guv

Great thanks, Is this being placed into the trunk?

I have noticed that the fix works but gantt charts sort by issue id when tasks are on the start on the same day.

The sort should take into account precedes and follows relationships.

I see the following issue but no action on it.  
<http://www.redmine.org/issues/3436>

It seems logical to include the precedes and follows in the sorting criteria for a gantt chart by default.

**#4 - 2010-09-20 21:01 - Gabriel Mazetto**

There is a patch to this issue, why it's not merged in the trunk yet?

**#5 - 2014-02-20 12:15 - Siebe Joris Jochems**

I have the same problem. I use the gantt chart a lot and I love the arrows between issues. When working with small issues (2 hours) a lot of those will start/end on the same day.

Another workaround for this issue is to specify a delay of -1 days when linking the issues.

**#6 - 2018-11-20 16:48 - Sebastian C**

8 years later, is there any update on this?  
Using a delay of -1 certainly works but it's incredibly confusing to anyone who doesn't know *why* it was necessary to do so.

**#7 - 2018-11-20 21:15 - Marius BĂLTEANU**

Sebastian C wrote:

8 years later, is there any update on this?  
Using a delay of -1 certainly works but it's incredibly confusing to anyone who doesn't know *why* it was necessary to do so.

There were some discussions about this on [#3195](#). I'll close this issue as duplicated.

**#8 - 2018-11-20 21:16 - Marius BĂLTEANU**

- *Is duplicate of Patch #3195: issue's start date could be the latest due date of predecessors added*

**#9 - 2018-11-20 21:16 - Marius BĂLTEANU**

- *Status changed from New to Closed*  
- *Resolution set to Duplicate*

**Files**

|                                     |           |            |               |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| seq_issues_start_end_same_day.patch | 534 Bytes | 2010-08-17 | Brian DeVries |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---------------|