



**THE SHAR'I  
STATUS OF  
SUNNATUL  
MUAKKADAH  
AND THE  
BASELESS OPINION  
OF LIBERALS**

**THE MAJLIS  
PO BOX 3393  
PORT ELIZABETH  
6056 SOUTH AFRICA**

**SUNNATUL MUAKKADAH IS  
AN ACT/PRACTICE RIGIDLY  
ADHERED TO BY  
RASULULLAH  
(SALLALLAHU  
ALAYHI WASALLAM) AND  
THE SAHAABAH**

**IT IS AN ACT WHICH THEY  
NEVER DISCARDED WITHOUT  
VALID REASON**

## THE CONFUSION OF THE LIBERALS

**Sunnatul Muakkadah** refers to such Acts of Islam which were rigidly observed by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah. Such practices would not be discarded without valid reason. While discardence because of valid reasons is not sinful, abstention from Sunnatul Muakkadah without valid reason is sinful.

Among the consequences of abstention/discardence of Sunnatul Muakkadah is deprivation from the Shafaa-ah (Intercession) of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the Day of Qiyaamah. If the only consequence is deprivation of Shafaa-ah of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then it is a gargantuan calamity beyond bearable capacity. Disdainfully discarding even Mustahab acts will deprive one from Shafaa-ah. The Sunnah of any category, may not be trifled with. But these liberal sheikhs twiddle with the Sunnah with their stupid twaddle.

Liberals and deviates due to their shallow understanding and lack of Taqwa have grievously confused Sunnatul Muakkadah with Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah, hence describing Sunnatul Muakkadah, the deviates say:

*“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*

This is an egregious error calculated to obfuscate and to strip the Deen of its reality and true form. In fact, this highly erroneous and stupid confusion is a huge step in a shaitaani process of deracinating the entire Shariah. Minus the innumerable Sunnatul Muakkadah attributes attached to the large variety of Ahkaam, there will remain not even a skeleton of the Shariah.

In fact, the definition:

*“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*

is not befitting even Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah, discardence of which is not sinful. Nevertheless, the disdain implicit in the definition predicates Istikhfaaf to even Mustahab acts. *Istikhfaaf* – to view as insignificant – of any Sunnat act regardless of its Fiqhi classification, is kufr.

The consequence of abandonment of even Mustahab/Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah acts will be a huge calamity in the Aakhirah. It will be understood in that realm by those whose relationship with the

Deen is lackadaisical and lukewarm or nominal and superficial.

Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“Whoever discards my Sunnah will not obtain my Shafaa-ah (Intercession).”* This fearful warning embraces discardence of all Sunnah acts regardless of later Fiqhi categorization. While discardence for valid reasons is acceptable and tolerable, abstention/discardence without valid reason is unacceptable, and this applies to even Mustahab acts. To be deprived of the Intercession of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is per se a huge Punishment.

While the consequence of discarding Mustahab is not the Fire of Jahannam, the calamity will shock the indolent ones on the Day of Qiyaamah. Taqwa and the acquisition of Roohaaniyat (lofty spirituality and proximity to Allah Ta’ala) are not attainable without strict observance of even Mustahab/Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah Acts of the Deen.

Nothing of the Deen should ever be viewed with disdain or regarded to be insignificant. Shaitaan’s assault on Imaan commences with his onslaught on the Mustahab factors which constitute the outer fortress protecting Imaan.

Practicing the Sunnah is by following the lifestyle of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, not by making a selection on the basis of the Fiqhi classification of Ahkaam. The juridical classification has its role to play according to circumstances. The objective of Fiqhi classification is never to dilute the Sunnah with the curse of intentional discardence of the Sunnah acts. The Qur'aan Majeed states:

*“For you there is a beautiful pattern of life in the Example of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) for him who fears Allah and the Last Day, and he remembers Allah abundantly.”*  
(Al-Ahzaab, Aayat 21)

## DISCARDING SUNNATUL MUAKKADAH

### *Question*

*We have always understood that omitting a Sunnatul Muakkadah act wilfully is sinful. I have now come across the following opinion:*

*“.....It is for some of the reasons above that Sh.Abu Ghuddah (in his ‘Fath Bab al-‘Inayah’) argued that missing an emphasised sunnah (i.e. Sunnatul Muakkadah) does not constitute sin. A person is rewarded for performing the sunnah and is not sinful for leaving it.....”*

*Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*

*Is this view valid?*

### ANSWER

This view of the deviate is corrupt, baseless and in glaring conflict with the Shariah as has been propounded by the Aimmah Mujtahideen and Fuqaha from the earliest era of Islam. The deviate has simply disgorged his flaccid opinion, having sucked it out of his thumb. It is devoid of Shar’i basis. A man’s personal opinion has absolutely no validity if it conflicts with the standard, accepted and well-established ruling of the Fuqaha of this Ummah – the Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era.

The deviate has erroneously attributed the figment of his corrupt imagination to Sheikh Abu Ghuddah. Insha-Allah, later in this treatise we shall present the view of Sheikh Abu Ghuddah. Despite the venerable Sheikh (Rahmatullah alayh) having inclined towards liberalism in some issues, the attribution to him of the corrupt understanding of Sunnah is false and renders him a grave injustice.

The Fuqaha have categorized the Ahkaam of the Shariah into different classes with each category having its specific attributes. The consequence of missing a Mustahab/Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah act is what the sheikh has confused with missing a Sunnatul Muakkadah practice.

“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.” This is the consequence applicable to Mustahab/Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah acts, not to Sunnatul Muakkadah practices as the liberal has erroneously concluded. If this had to be the consequence of missing even a Sunnatul Muakkadah act, then what is the difference between Muakkad and Ghair Muakkad? The Fuqaha did not indulge in futile mental gymnastics regarding the Usool and Furoo’ of the Shariah. They had understood the Qur’aan and the Hadith in a manner which all the

Ulama of today will not understand even if they are reborn and devote their entire lives to the pursuit of Ilm. The Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era were created by Allah Ta'ala for the specific objective of expounding, codifying and formalizing the Shariah which stems from the Qur'aan and Sunnah.

Omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah even once, without valid reason is SINFUL. Omitting the two raka'ts Sunnatul Muakkadah of Fajr is a major sin, if the omission is not accompanied by a valid reason – a reason recognized by the Shariah as valid. The same applies to omit the other Sunnatul Muakkadah rakats of the other Salaat without valid reason.

To eat with the right hand: Is it Mustahab or Sunnatul Muakkadah? If some moron says that it is Mustahab and that it is not sinful not to eat with the right hand and that it is permissible to eat with the left hand – the hand with which shaitaan eats – then clearly the chap is either confused or a deviate liberal suffering from intellectual necrosis.

In the meaning of Fiqh, Sunnah is of two categories: Sunnatul Muakkadah and Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah. Sunnatul Muakkadah is an act practiced perpetually by Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and the Sahaabah, and they would not omit it without valid reason. Its hukm (effect) is

similar to Waajib. Omission without valid reason is sinful. The perpetrator of the omission is a Faasiq and he will be deprived of the Shafaa-ah (Intercession) of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) on the Day of Qiyaamah.

Merely on the basis of deprivation from the special Shafaa-ah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), the Fuqaha say: “Thus omitting of Sunnatul Muakkadah is near to Haraam.” (Shaami) Thus, even if it is assumed that the only punishment for the omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah is Hirmaan anish Shafaa-ah (to be deprived of the Intercession of Rasulullah – Sallallahu alayhi wasallam), then that by itself is an Athaab (Punishment) of gargantuan proportions.

Shafaa-ah in the context here does not refer to *Mutlaq Shafaa-ah* which all sinners of this Ummah will be blessed with. In the context of our discussion, Shafaa-ah refers to the specific Intercession with which the upholders of the Sunnah will be blessed.

The difference between omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah and omission of Waajib is that the sin in the latter omission is greater. The dividing line between the two categories of Sunnah is well-defined and distinct. The two categories are not blurred. The

Fuqaha did not indulge in play and futility when they categorized the Ahkaam of the Shariah.

The effects and attributes of Sunnatul Muakkadah and Sunnatul Ghair Muakkadah do not merge into ambiguity. The Fuqaha-e-Mutaqaddimeen did not leave any aspect of the Shariah undefined nor did they postpone, for example, the definition and classification of Sunnatul Muakkadah for some liberal chap who would appear on the horizon 12 or 13 centuries after the era of Khairul Quroon. The liberal sheikhs who nibble at the Ahkaam of the Shariah to mould these into a new form, are in reality deviated morons regardless of their smattering of expertise in the 'sciences' of Deeni Ilm. The liberals disgorge their personal opinions unsubstantiated by the Nusoos of the Shariah. The Shariah is not the product of unsubstantiated opinion which wildly vacillates between the nafs and unbridled employment of intelligence bereft of Taqwa.

The type of convoluted opinions these liberal sheikhs/molvis disgorge is typical nafsानी obfuscation and a miserable lack of perspective. They just do not know whether they are moving forward or backwards.

The liberal sheikhs have not accorded any respect to the rulings of the Authorities of the Shariah. He

merely proffers his personal opinion in total isolation of what the Authorities of the Shariah have ruled. The Fuqaha have stated explicitly that Sunnatul Muakkadah is tantamount to Waajib and its omission without valid reason is sinful

Shaami states: “Sunnatul Muakkadah is close to Waajib. The one who omits it is astray because its omission is Istikhfaaf (disdain) for the Deen.”

Badaai-us Sanaa’ states: “Sunnatul Muakkadah and Waajib are the same. Do you not see that Al-Karkhi has defined it as Sunnat then explained it as Waajib.”

Al-Inaayah Sharh Hidaayah states: “Sunnatul Muakkadah resembles Waajib in strength so much so that it is cited as a basis for the existence of Imaan. The Fuqaha have termed it Sunnatul Huda, i.e. Adoption of it is guidance and abandonment of it is deviation.”

Shaami states: “The one who omits Waajib is sinful, and similar is Sunnatul Muakkadah (i.e. omission of it is sinful)...Thus omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah is near to Haraam.”

In Al-Muheetul Burhaani it is mentioned: “Makhool said: ‘Its omission (i.e. omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah) is Dhalaalah (Deviation), e.g. Athaan,

Iqaamah, Eid Salaat and Jama'ah Salaat. They (the Muslims) should fight (qitaal) against Dhalaalah....”

“The one who abandons it (Sunnatul Muakkadah) shall be beaten (whipped) and imprisoned because he has abandoned Sunnatul Muakkadah. He will not be killed.”

The Fuqaha have prescribed whipping and imprisonment for those who abandon Sunnatul Muakkadah, but the liberal sheikh of this belated era says that it is not sinful to abandon the compulsory Sunnatul Muakkadah acts. Compulsion is of several kinds: Fardh, Waajib and Sunnatul Muakkadah.

Athaan, Iqaamah, Eid Salaat and Jama'ah Salaat are classified Sunnatul Muakkadah. How can it ever not be sinful to abandon these salient Acts of Islam? The Khalifah will wage Jihad against a Muslim community who neglects or abandons these Sunnatul Muakkadah Acts of the Deen.

To brush off Sunnatul Muakkadah as an act of insignificance with the corrupt averment of:

*“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*

is obnoxious and Istikhfaaf which is akin to kufr. While the liberal sheikhs/molvis says that no sin is

committed if Sunnatul Muakkadah is omitted without valid reason, the Fuqaha unanimously say that such omission is *Qareeb minal Haraam* (close to Haraam). Does the Ummah follow the liberal deviates of this belated corrupt era in close proximity to Qiyaamah or the Rulings of the Fuqaha of the era of Khairul Quroon – whose era was in close proximity to Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)?

Regarding the Fuqaha of the Khairul Quroon era, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Honour my Sahaabah, for verily they are your noblest, then those after them, then those after them. Then KITHB (falsehood) will become prevalent.*” The copro opinions of the deviate come fully within the scope of **KITHB** stated in the Hadith.

For gaining the correct answer, Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: “*Seek a fatwa from your heart.*”

### ***Question***

***Another argument given is: “Not only does a new convert or newly practicing believer now feel he must perform five prayers a day, but you have now increased that to ten with the additional emphasised sunnahs being pseudo-obligations.”***

## **Answer**

The dunderhead jaahil is guilty of Istikhfaaf for denigrating the lofty status and true meaning of Sunnatul Muakkada by describing it as **pseudo-obligations**. The term pseudo implies disdain. It means incorrect application. The jaahil is implying that all the illustrious Aimmah and Fuqaha of Islam, Mutaqaddimeen and Muta-akh-khireen – had wrongly understood the Sunnat practices and had erroneously defined the categories of the Sunnah.

Sunnatul Muakkadah practices are not **pseudo-obligations**. They are compulsory obligations. The meaning of Sunnatul Muakkadah cannot be altered to soothe the nafsani dictates of converts. Regardless of any convert believing that observance of Sunnatul Muakkadah is burdensome, the reality of the Ahkaam may not be swept under the carpet or concealed from the convert. It is extremely stupid to effect a change in the meanings of the Ahkaam on the basis of the feelings of converts. The ‘feelings’ of converts do not constitute daleel in the Shariah.

The convert has to gradually learn how to perform Salaat correctly. While his ignorance is tolerable initially, he has to make an effort to acquire the necessary degree of knowledge to enable him to act and live like a Muslim. His conversion is not a favour on Islam. He has rendered himself the greatest favour

by accepting Islam. If Islam is burdensome to him, the exit door remains open.

A convert who sincerely enters into the glorious fold of Islam, does not entertain the 'ten' stupid notion suggested by the moron deviate. If the Sunnatul Muakkadah aspects of Salaat are burdensome for the convert, then in fact, Salaat itself will be repulsive and burdensome to him. If indeed he cherishes disdain and scorn for Salaat, then his entry into Islam will be hypocritical, and the following Aayat of the Qur'aan will apply to him:

*“When they come to you (Muslimeen), they say: ‘We have believed’, whereas they have entered with kufr and have exited (from Islam) with it (kufr).”*

*(Al-Maaidah, Aayat 61)*

The hypocritical 'islam' of such 'converts' is not needed. When a person adopts Islam, he is not bestowing any favour on Islam or on the Ummah. He renders himself the greatest favour if he accepts Islam with sincerity. The Qur'aan Majeed explaining the adoption of Imaan by converts, says:

*“They (the hypocrites) flaunt for you their  
(acceptance) of Islam.*

*Say (to them): ‘Don't flaunt for me your islam. On the contrary, Allah has favoured you by guiding you*

*to Imaan, if indeed you are truthful (in your acceptance of Islam)'.”*  
*(Al-Hujuraat, Aayat 17)*

For a convert who labours under the misconception of the Sunnatul Muakkadah acts increasing Salaat tenfold as the deviate has stupidly asserted, the Qur'aan Majeed reprimandingly warns:

*“The villagers say: ‘We have accepted Imaan’. Say (to them):*

*‘You have not accepted Imaan. On the contrary, you should say: ‘We have adopted Islam’, because Imaan has not entered your hearts. If you obey Allah and His Rasool, Allah will not allow your deeds to be minimized in any way whatsoever.’”*

*(Al-Hujuraat, Aayat 14)*

Furthermore, the non-Muslim who embraces Islam, is never compelled or pressurized to fulfil even the Fardh and Waajib acts of Salaat. Only a moron expects that a non-Muslim entering the fold of Islam today will simultaneously be able to recite Qir'aat, Tashahhud, Durood, Dua and Tasbeeh.

The new convert will be shown how to execute the various physical postures of Salaat and advised to recite just *Subhaanallah* thrice in every posture, and to recite this Tasbeeh more times in Qa'dah for the

duration of Tashahhud. Or in Qiyaam, he could recite the simple aayat of '*Bismillaahir Rahmaanir Raheem*' thrice. His Salaat in this manner, i.e. minus the Fardh, Waajib and Sunnat acts, will be valid. The stupidity of the incremental 'ten' mentioned by the deviate has no validity.

The fellow has indeed scraped the bottom of the barrel of stupidity with his ultra-ludicrous argument.

### ***Question***

***Another argument presented for his view is:***

***"It is very common to hear that missing an emphasised sunnah constitutes sin when done 'habitually'. Firstly, to say that it is sinful if missed 'habitually' is to say the sin is not intrinsic to the act of missing a sunnah, because were it intrinsic to the act of missing sunnah, it would be sinful irrespective of whether it was missed once or ten times."***

### **Answer**

This is another baseless argument to minimize the importance of Sunnatul Muakkadah. The stipulation of 'habitual' missing is a view of some Fuqaha. It does not follow from this one view that in the absence of the omission being habitual, it is not sinful. Since Sunnatul Muakkadah is akin to Waajib, omission even once without valid reason is sinful.

Furthermore, the deviate is casting aspersions at the illustrious Aimmah Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha who have mentioned '*habitual*' omission. Fuqaha of all Math-habs have predicated *habitual* with omission. Their understanding of the issue is of importance, not the silly argument of the deviate who has appointed himself as a 'mujtahid' capable of dissecting and cancelling the rulings of the Aimmah Mujtahideen.

His brains are intrinsically eburnated, hence he has the temerity of implying that the Fuqaha's predication of the term is ignorance. Even pious persons may occasionally miss an act of importance indolently without intent. Hence to avoid stripping the *adaalah* of such persons, the omission has been predicated with 'habitual' by some Fuqaha.

“Saahibul Bahr have explicitly stated that it is obvious from the statements of the Ahl-e-Math-hab that the sin pivots on omission of Waajib and Sunnatul Muakkadah. This is the authentic view.” (Shaami)

“Sunnatul Muakkadah is in the category of Waajib, hence a person sins by omitting Sunnatul Muakkadah like (omitting) Waajib.” (Majmaul Anhaar)

“In Sharhul Minaar of Shaikh Zain is mentioned: ‘The most authentic version is that a person sins by omitting (Sunnat) Muakkadah because it is in the category of Waajib.’ (Haashiyah Tahtaawi)

“The Asah version is that one sins by omitting (Sunnat) Al-Muakkadah.”  
(Al-Bahrur Raa-iq)

Juggling the term, habitual with mental tricks does not yield the objective of the liberal sheikh. He has in entirety ignored the unanimous explicit ruling of the Fuqaha, viz., that Sunnatul Muakkadah is akin to Waajib and its omission without valid reason is sinful. The factor of Israar (habitual) being the view of some Fuqaha does not negate the sinfulness of omitting or abandoning Sunnatul Muakkadah. Ignoring the Israar factor in no way whatsoever detracts from the sinful consequence stemming from omission of the Sunnah.

This Ruling of the Shariah may not be tampered with. It is clear deviation for anyone after 14 centuries have passed over the Ummah to attempt tampering with and altering the Ahkaam. To change a meaning which the Ummah has known and accepted since the very inception of Islam is clear deviation inspired by Iblees who imparts the science of lincination – nibbling and slashing the Ahkaam with the objective

of scuttling the Shariah. This is the pernicious occupation of all liberals. They are satanic experts in the art of Dhalaal.

Another stupid argument disingenuously proffered for negating the importance of Sunnatul Muakkadah, is that abandoning Sunnatul Muakkadah does not come within the purview of the Hadith:

*“Whoever, turns away from my sunnah is not of me.”*

This is indeed a super-moronic shaitaani understanding. The term, Sunnah in this Hadith brings within its purview the entire Shariah with all its practices stemming from the Sunnah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam). It is not contended that this word refers in particular to Sunnatul Muakkadah. This is a baseless presumption of the moron who seeks to scuttle such ‘emphasized’ (Muakkadah) Sunnah practices which the Fuqaha have categorized as Sunnatul Muakkadah.

There is no disputing the fact that the word Sunnah in the context of the aforementioned Hadith covers all the acts and practices of the Sunnah whether these have later been classified as Muakkadah, Ghair Muakkadah, Fardh, Waajib and Mustahab. Thus, Sunnatul Muakkadah acts may not be excluded from this all-embracing term. Every Sunnah, regardless of

its Fiqhi connotation is integral to the Uswah Hasanah (Beautiful Pattern of Life) of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Seeking to bolster his corrupt view, the modernist moron citing the liberal Sheikh Abu Ghuddah, says:

*“The hadith mentions ‘turning away/being displeased (ar-raghat anhu) with the prophetic way (sunnah) which, Sh.Abu Ghuddah argues, is not the same as simply ‘leaving’ (at-tark) an act. A person can leave an act without turning away and being displeased with it.*

*Therefore, this hadith is not a strong argument to declare the habitual leaving of an emphasised sunnah a sin.”*

This argument is absolute bunkum. It is devoid of substance. It is a stupidity which may hoodwink ignoramuses. A man who habitually neglects a Sunnah act displays blatant disdain (*Istikhfaaf*), for the act. He attaches no significance to a practice which Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had perpetually adopted and glowingly spoke of. This man – the habitual criminal – in reality abandons the Sunnah, and by his abandonment he turns away from it thus coming fully within the scope of *“Laisa minni (Is not of me).”*

The argument centred on the term *at-tark* (leaving, abstaining, neglecting, abandoning, etc.) is a stupid mental trick to obfuscate. It is a multivalent term. The meaning applicable will rely on the individual who abstains from the Sunnah act. It is not contended that the term 'taraka' always produces the consequence of '*raghabh anhu*'. The simple contention is that the consequence of '*tark*' is sinful just as all other prohibitions are sinful without incumbently attributing '*laisa minni*' to them.

Furthermore, the Ummah accepts the classification of Sunnatul Muakkadah on the basis of the explicit Rulings of the Aimmah Mujtahideen and the Fuqaha of all ages. We do not extravagagate meanings from Hadith and Qur'aan. We are Muqallideen of the Amimmah Mujtahideen. We did not coin the Sunnatul Muakkadah category. We accept it on the basis of the explicit Rulings of the Fuqaha.

It is not the function of Muqallideen to extrapolate interpretations and meanings from the Qur'aan and Hadith. Liberal sheikhs/molvis and even the most pious Allaamah of this era and all the Ulama are Muqallideen. Any Muqallid molvi, or sheikh who renounces his Taqleed is a deviate. Deviates (Zanaadaqah) suffer from this kufr disease.

All Ulama in relation to the Fuqaha of Khairul Quroon are a non-entities. It is a monstrous stupidity to scuttle the unanimous view of the early Fuqaha on the basis of the personal opinion of a muqallid, a non-entity, who mushroomed up 12 centuries later. Aggravating his egregious error is that his opinion is unsubstantiated by Shar’i daleel. We do not say that an act is Sunnatul Muakkadah on the basis of our personal opinion. We say that it is Sunnatul Muakkadah because the Fuqaha of the Ummah of the earliest era of Islam have ruled so. Therefore, seeking to dislodge the Ruling of the Fuqaha by presenting irrelevant arguments of the nafs and proffering same in a devious manner to convey the corrupt idea of the Fiqhi category being the determination of the orthodox Ulama of this age, is a disingenuous exercise in chicanery.

The modernist says: *“It is therefore incorrect to argue that because a hadith says ‘sunnah’ that it must be referring to the later juristic definition of ‘sunnah’ (let alone the subset ‘sunnah makkadah’), as this is anachronistic. The claim that missing a sunnah habitually is sinful is therefore an inaccurate reading of the hadith.”*

This is more nonsense added to the baseless argument for negating the importance and emphasis of Sunnah Muakkadah. The ‘anachronism’ is a

figment of his mental convolution. The contention is not what the moron alleges. It has not been asserted that the meaning of Sunnah in the context of Hadith refers specifically to the 'later juristic definition'. This is a stupid dissonant, arbitrary conclusion which is rejected as baseless. The term Sunnah mentioned in the Hadith covers all acts of Islam regardless of later juristic classification. Regardless of the Fiqhi category to which any Sunnah act is assigned, it comes within the scope of the meaning of 'Sunnah' stated in the Hadith. And, regardless of the omission being once or habitual, its Sunnah status remains unaltered. The *Saheeh* or *Asah* view is that it is sinful to omit Sunnatul Muakkadah.

The very fact of having classified Sunnah into two categories, Muakkad and Ghair Muakkad, confirms the sinful consequence of omission of the former category, not the latter category. In view of the vast difference in the classes of Sunnah, the Fuqaha have categorized the Ahkaam to draw the line between the two classes so that the line is not crossed to enter the domain of sin.

### **Excoriation of the Acts of Ibaadat**

The modernists and liberals say:

*“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*

This absolutely flappedoodle averment displays the cognitive dissonance of its propounders. They have miserably failed to apply their brains correctly, hence they remain ignorant as to the consequence of their stupid utterances. Consider the example of omitting the two Sunnatul Muakkadah raka'ts of Fajr which have great emphasis.

If some moron, on the basis of the aforementioned idea of the liberal deviate, decides to permanently abandon performing these two raka'ts, what shall be the fatwa? According to the understanding of the Zanaadaqah, he will not be sinful. He only "misses an opportunity for great reward but is not sinful."

This conclusion (of greater reward and no sin) applies to the omission/abandonment of Sunnats of a lesser degree of emphasis. Now if some moron decides on the basis of the satanic principle evolved by the Zanaadaqah to perform Salaat minus ALL the Sunan whether Muakkad or Ghair Muakkad, what shall be the fatwa?

This chap now performs Salaat as follows: Recites Takbeer Tahrimah without raising the hands to the ears; he leaves his hands at the sides for the entire duration of the Salaat; he omits Thanā, Ta-awwuz and Tasmiyah; he does not stand fully in Qaumah,

and he does not recite the Tahmeed; he does not recite any Tasbeeh in Ruku'; he does not recite Tasbeeh in Sajdah; he does not sit in Jalsah. He partially emerges from the first Sajdah then returns to the second Sajdah; he omits Durood and Dua from Qa'dah Akheerah; he does not turn his head left and right when making Salaam. Being in a hot land, he performs Salaat in the Masjid dressed in only a loin cloth covering only from the navel to the knees.

What is the fatwa? Remember, that he has omitted only Sunnat acts. The fatwa according to the morons is that his Salaat is quite in order because he has not sinned because of his wholesale omissions. He has "only missed the opportunity for great reward". But what is the fatwa of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam)? When a Sahaabi had performed Salaat haphazardly, our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: "*Again perform Salaat, for verily, you have not performed Salaat.*" He was ordered to repeat the Salaat three times.

Furthermore, the Salaat of such a moron is not valid by Allah Ta'ala. In terms of the Hadith, a Salaat performed without observance of the Sunnah acts is wrapped like an old dirty rag and flung onto the face of the one who had performed such a corrupt Salaat – a Salaat minus the Sunnah acts. The heavenly portals of Maqbooliyat are closed for such a dirty-rag

‘salaat’. It is flung back to earth to despoil the face of the reckless performer.

Consider the example of Hajj. It has ahkaam of a variety of categories. This chap performs his Hajj as follows:

He omits Tawaaf-e-Qudoom; he abstains from Ramal; he does not spend the 9th night at Minah; he does not proceed from Mina to Arafaat after sunrise on the 9th. He does not depart from Arafaat with the Imaam. He does not spend the night at Muzdalifah. He recites the Talbiyah only once during the entire duration of the Hajj. He abstains from Idhtiba. He does not begin Tawaaf from Hajr Aswad, and he abstains from all other Sunnat acts attached to the variety of ritual acts of Hajj. What is the fatwa?

Consider the example of Wudhu. Since the person is brainwashed with the idea that *“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*, he abstains from making masah of the whole head. He abstains from khilaal of the fingers, beard and toes. He washes once and sometimes twice. He abstains from masah of the ears, and he regularly and permanently abandons all Sunnah acts regardless of their Fiqhi classification. What will be the fatwa?

Jama'ah Salaat is Sunnatul Muakkadah. What is the fatwa if someone abstains from Jama'ah Salaat and decides to perform individually at home because of the convenience and because it is supposedly 'not sinful', and abstention results in 'only missing great reward' in which the jaahil is not interested?

If Athaan and Iqaamah are abandoned even occasionally on the basis of the aforementioned convoluted concoction given to Sunnatul Muakkadah, will it be tolerable in the Shariah?

What fatwa is there for someone whose brains have been cast into imbalance with this type of cognitive convolution which appeases and delights Iblees? Rasulallah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) had expressed the desire to burn down the homes of those who abstain from Jama'ah Salaat. But the liberals and modernists say that abstention from Sunnatul Muakkadah is not sinful.

And what is the fatwa if the Imaam decides to recite the Jumuah Khutbah sitting without valid reason, and he decides to recite only one khutbah, not two as demanded by the Sunnah? And, what is the fatwa if the Imaam decides to recite the Khutbah standing in the Mihraab facing the Qiblah, not the Musallis? And what shall be said about an Imaam who rattles off

both the Khutbahs in English? According to the liberal shaikh all of these vile infractions are permissible, not sinful and the effect is 'only loss of great thawaab'. It is indeed lamentable that the liberal sheikh has no valid understanding of the meaning of Thawaab and Sunnah.

It is Sunnatul Muakkadah for the musallis to sit facing the Qiblah while the Imaam is reciting the Khutbah. What will be the fatwa if the musallis decide to sit with their backs towards the Qiblah while the Imaam is reciting the Khutbah? After all, the moron liberal says that it is not sinful to do so because it is only Sunnatul Muakkadah, not Fardh.

And, what shall we say if the Sunnatul Muakkadah Eid Khutbah is discarded in entirety while only the Eid Salaat is performed? Justifying the omission it is argued that discarding Sunnatul Muakkadah is not sinful.

If this haraam process of excoriating the Ahkaam and denuding them of all the Sunnah factors and attributes is allowed, condoned and promoted with stupid averments such as

*“Missing an emphasised sunnah should be seen as missing an opportunity for great reward, but it does not constitute sin.”*, then nothing of the Shariah will

remain. Imaan will be tremendously eviscerated and dangle on a thread or even extinguished.

The objective of Fiqhi classification is not for promoting a category which detracts from the importance and rigid implementation of Sunnah acts. The Sahaabah and the Muslims of the early eras of Islam did not utilize the Fiqhi classification to undermine practical and rigid implementation of all the Sunnah factors regardless of their Fiqhi categorization.

The categorization of Sunnah practices into the classes of Mustahab and Ghair Muakkadah are for indolent, careless persons whose ties with the Deen are lukewarm. The Fiqhi classification alerts them to the minimum requisites necessary for the validity of an act of Ibaadat.

The classification is also for application in times of need. For example, if someone overslept and the sun is about to rise in a couple of minutes. It will be permissible, in fact incumbent, for this person to rush with his wudhu and Fajr Salaat by discarding all the Sunnat and Mustahab factors, including the Sunnatul Muakkadah, to ensure that his Fajr Salaat does not become Qadha.

The arguments of the liberals, modernists and zanaadaqah proffered to justify discardence of Sunnatul Muakkadah and for bolstering their claim of discardence not being sinful, are absolutely baatil – baseless and corrupt. Minus rigid observance of Sunnatul Muakkadah acts, the entire Deen will be scuttled.

## **THE SUNNAH IS THE BASIS OF TAQWA**

Allah Ta'ala states in the Qur'aan Majeed: *“Verily Allah loves the Muttaqeen.”* Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said: *“The Mu'min will never reach the rank of the Muttaqeen as long as he does not abandon (deeds) in which there is no harm for fear of lapsing into deeds in which there is harm.”*

Excessive indulgence in permissible acts and in mushtabah (doubtful) acts prevents from the acquisition of Taqwa. Thus such a person is deprived of the love of Allah Ta'ala. This deprivation in fact is a colossal punishment. Punishment is not restricted to Jahannam.

Refraining from acquiring 'great reward' by abstaining from Sunnah acts regardless of their Fiqhi classification deprives the Muslim in entirety from the Love of Allah Ta'ala. Is such a consequence acceptable and tolerable to a Mu'min? But this is the consequence of submitting to the satanic opinions of

the liberals and zanaadaqah. The opposite of Divine Love is Divine Wrath, and this is the consequence of abstention from the Sunnah.

Islam is the Deen of Belief and Practice (Imaan and Amal). The Ummah is not in need of the opinions of the liberal scoundrel sheikhs and zanaadaqah for understanding the meaning of Amal (Practice). Furthermore, Practical implementation of the Sunnah is not reliant on the Fiqhi classification of the Ahkaam. Amal is understood from the lifestyle of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi Wasallam) and the Sahaabah. The Uswah Hasanah of our Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is the criterion for Amal, not Fiqhi classifications. Any interpretation or opinion which detracts from the rigidity of the Sunnah dimension adorning the Ahkaam is mardood, mal-oon and mabghoodh, and must incumbently be rejected.

The objective of life on earth is to gain the Ridha (Pleasure) of Allah Ta'ala, and this Maqsad is unattainable without rigid observance of the Sunnah. The Sunnah consists of two fundamentals: the Qur'aan and Hadith. An interpretation/opinion which ignores this vital objective demonstrates a disingenuous attempt to churn up dust and smoke for the modernist and ignorant cohorts of Iblees for denying the purpose of life on earth.

The extreme velleity of modernists pertaining to the Ahkaam of the Shariah is the effect of denying or ignoring the objective of life on earth. Since worldly life holds priority for them, antiquating the Shariah has become their way. It is a way they have acquired from their atheist western masters who have welded their brains in the straitjacket of kufr liberalism. Thus they view the Ahkaam obliquely through their blinkered western glasses. This disease has unfortunately been contracted by most of the liberal sheikhs and molvis of this age. Their occupation is to dilute the Sunnah and to undermine and argue away the Ahkaam which the Fuqaha have structured on the premises of the Qur'aan and Hadith.

For executing their pernicious shaitaani designs, they dig from the Fiqh Kutub technical definitions and technicalities to scuttle the rigidity of the Sunnah as practiced by the Sahaabah without realizing that in so doing they have made their exit from Islam.

The Fiqhi determination of six Fardh acts in Salaat (according to the Hanafi Math-hab) is not for discarding the Sunnah or for velleity regarding practical implementation. Similarly, wilful abandonment of Mustahab/Mandoob practices on the basis of Fiqhi definitions is not permissible.

It is this attitude of disdain shown for the Sunnah which has induced scoundrels with the temerity of halaalizing blatantly haraam acts and practices. For example, the mass killing of chickens in kuffaar slaughter-houses is halaalized on the mere basis of the Fiqhi technicality of the neck-veins being severed. The entire Sunnah system of Thabah has been scuttled and abrogated on the basis of this one misappropriated Fiqhi technicality, and the objective is nothing but the carrion of the world- the haraam boodle. Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) said that the world is 'jeefah' (carrion). For this carrion, Muslims have abandoned the Sunnah and destroyed their Imaan, justifying their hypocrisy and kufr on the basis of a Fiqhi technicality.

## AS-SUNNATUL MUAKKADAH ACCORDING TO THE MATH-HABS

### **Hanafi**

The view of the Hanafi Math-hab has already been elaborated. More detail follows:

“Sunnah Muakkadah: It is further mentioned in Al-Muheet: ‘There is no concession for anyone to omit it except for a valid reason. So much so that if the people of the city abandon it, they shall be commanded (by the authorities) with its observance. If they refuse, *qitaal* (jihad) against them will be halaal because, verily, it (Sunnah Muakkadah) is of the salient features of Islam and of the special characteristics of this Deen. Therefore it is imperative to display them (by adherence) and to reprimand on its omission.”

It has been said that it (Sunnah Muakkadah) is Waajib. A Jamaa-ah of the Mashaaikh have adopted this view (Al-Ghaayah). The majority of our Mashaaikh said: ‘Verily Jama’ah (Salaat) is Waajib. In At-Tuhfah, Imaam Muhammad has mentioned in other (treatises) besides Riwaayatul Usool: ‘Al-Jama’ah is Waajib.’ Some of our (Hanafi) As-haab (Fuqaha) have named it Sunnah Muakkadah, However, in meaning both are the same.”

Salaatul Eid is Waajib according to us according to the Asah view, not Sunnah as is the view of Maalik and Shaafi'. Some of our (Hanafi) As-haab have also said that it is Sunnah. The obvious meaning is that it is Sunnah Muakkadah. Adopting it is *Huda* (guidance), and abandoning it is *Dhalaalah* (deviation) because of the constancy of Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) without omitting it.” (*Fathu Baabil Inaayah*)

The upshot of this exposition is that due to the imperative importance of Sunnah Muakkadah it is termed Waajib by Fuqaha of all Math-habs. Practically both terms have the same meaning. Omission without valid reason is haraam and sinful.

### **Shaafi' Math-hab**

As-Subki said: “As-Sunnatul Muakkadah is an act regarding which the *daleel* strengthens the abomination of omitting it. As-Sunnatul Muakkadah is near to Waajib just as Makrooh is near to Haraam. These two are opposites. Things are recognized from their opposites. Thus, just as omission of Waajib is haraam, so too is omission of As-Sunnatul Muakkadah Makrooh (i.e. Makrooh Tahrimi which is forbidden).” (*Qadhaaul Irb fi As-alitil Halb*)

“It is Makrooh for a person to neglect Jamaa’ah Salaat. Thus, omission of As-Sunnatul Muakkadah necessitates Karaahah (Tahrimi).”

*(Haashiyatul Ibaadi alal Ghararil Bahiyyah)*

“Al-Qaadhi Husain and others labelled him a sinner for omitting these Sunan, for verily they are Muakkad, hence the one who neglects/omits it is certainly a sinner.”

“Jama’ah (Salaat) is Sunnah Muakkadah. Our (Shaafi) As-haab said that its omission is Makrooh. Shaikh Abu Haamid, Ibnus Sabbaagh and others have explicitly stated so.”

*(Al-Majmoo’)*

### **Hambali Math-hab**

In Fusool: “Constancy in neglecting As-Sunnatu Raatibah is not permissible.....He is regarded as one who turns away from the Sunnah.....This demands that the hukm of Fisq be attributed to him. A Jama-ah (of Fuqaha) narrated that a person who omits Witr is not an *Aadil* (i.e. *he is a faasiq*).....”

“One who is constant in omitting the Sunnan of Salaat is an evil person.”

*(Al-Furoo’ li Ibnil Muflih)*

“Anyone who omits anything from these Sunan, for him it is Sunnah to make its Qadha. This is the Mash-hoor Math-hab according to the As-haab (Hambali Fuqaha). It is stated in Al-Furoo’, Ar-Riaayah, Ibn Tameem, Al-Faa-iq and Majmaul Bahrain that according to the *Asah* (Most Authentic view) it is Sunnah (to make Qadha).

Al-Majd substantiates it in his Sharh, and Shaikh Taqiuddeen has adopted it, and he has confirmed it in Al-Wajeez, Al-Hidaayah, Al-Khulaasah, etc. He has accorded it priority in the introduction of Al-Mustauib, etc.

In one view according to him, Qadha is not Mustahab. According to him the two raka’ts Fajr should be made Qadha until the time of Dhuhaa. It has been said that even the two (Sunnah) raka’ts of Zuhr should be made Qadha (if missed).

“Ahmad said: ‘He who neglects Witr is an evil person.’”

*(Al-Ansaaf lil Mardaawi)*

“Witr is Sunnah Muakkadah. Imaam Ahmed said the one who omits it is an evil person. His testimony shall not be accepted.” *(Al-Mughni)*

## **Maaliki Math-hab**

“It is Makrooh (forbidden) for the Musalli to intentionally omit (even) Sunnat Khafeefah (i.e. Ghair Muakkadah). However, omission of As-Sunnatul Muakkadah is haraam.”

*(Fiqhul Ibaadaat alal Math-habil Maaliki)*

“It is haraam to omit As-Sunnatul Muakkadah.”

*(Al-Khulaasatul Fiqhiyyah alaa Math-habis Saadatil Maalikiyyah)*

“According to some authorities As-Sunnatul Muakkadah refers to Waajib.”

*(Mawaahibul Jaleel)*

“Sunnat Waajibah, i.e. Muakkadah – Whoever omits it without valid reason, his Imaamate is not permissible nor his Shahaadat (testimony).”

“Khaleel said that Sunnah Khafeefah refers to Mustahab.”

*(Al-Fawaakihud Dawaani)*

“It is abominable/detested – Makrooh (i.e. Tahrimi) to omit (even) Sunnah Khafeefah, i.e. Mustahab, intentionally of the Sunan of Salaat, e.g. Takbeer, and Tasmiyah, and it is haraam to omit As-Sunnatul Muakkadah.”

*(Ashalul Masdaarik)*

Thus, omission of even Mustahab acts is prohibited. It is detested and not permissible. The abomination extends to even omission of Mustahab (Sunnat Khafeefah) without valid reason.

## SHAIKH ABU GHUDDAH AND IBN DAQEEQ

The deviate has ignorantly attempted to extravasate support for his corrupt view by false attribution to Sheikh Ghuddah and selectively citing Ibn Daqeeq. Despite the venerable Shaikh having had some liberal leanings, he did not advocate that omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah is permissible and not sinful. His dissertation clearly highlights the importance of observing even Mustahabbaat. In his view there is no lackadaisical treatment of the Sunan such as ascribed to him by the modernist jaahil deviate. Rather, he held that it is sinful and omission without valid reason is not permissible.

Parasitically seeking to eke support from Shaikh Abu Ghuddah, the dunderhead deviate states:

*“.....Sh. Abu Ghuddah (in his ‘Fath Bab al-Inayah’) argued that missing an emphasised sunnah does not constitute sin. A person is rewarded for performing the sunnah and it is not sinful for leaving it.”*

Firstly, *Fath Baab al-Inayah* is not the kitaab of Shaikh Abu Ghuddah. It is the work of Mullah Ali Qaari. This blunder illustrates the copro ‘erudition’ of the deviate.

Nowhere in *Fath Baab al-Inayah* is the assertion of the deviate mentioned. What is mentioned in *Fath Baab al-Inayah* appears hereunder.

The following is the dissertation of Shaikh Abu Ghuddah stated in his *Kitaab, As-Sunnatun Nabawiyyah wa Madlooluha*:

“The word Sunnah in the Hadith of Nabi (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and in the speech of the Sahaabah and Taabieen refers to the Shar’i Tareeqah (Prescribed Way) in the Deen. It is not equated to Fardh or Waajib which are ‘Sunnah’ in the technical terminology of the Fuqaha.

“It should be noted at this juncture that some of the Ulama and mutafaqqiheen (bogus fuqaha) of our contemporary era - those who have a lackadaisical attitude towards adherence to the Sunnah, when some of them were upbraided regarding their omission of the Sunnah, they retorted: *‘It is only Sunnah, and its omission is permissible.’ (They were guilty of the kufr of Istikhfaaf for their disdainful dismissal of the Sunnah of Rasulullah- Sallallahu alayhi wasallam – Mujlisul Ulama)*

Thus, they extract a negative meaning from the Fiqhi definition of Sunnah, namely, permissibility to abandon. They abandon the positive meaning which

demands obedience and following (*Ittibaa’ and Iqtidaa’*) while the opposite of this attitude is befitting the intelligent/discerning Muslim. (*That is: strict observance*).

Verily, the Salaful Awwal (Sahaabah, Taabi-een and Taba-e-Taabieen) would practically implement every Shar’i requisite even if it was (only) recommended or virtuous. **They would act on these requisites without differentiating between Fardh, Waajib, Targheeb and Nudb (i.e. Mustahab - acts which are not compulsory).**

Thus, the Sunan Mandoobah (Recommended acts of Sunnah) constitute a fortress (for the protection) of the Faraaidh (Obligatory Acts). It is the method for increasing virtuous deeds and acquisition of *Noor* for those who practice it. It is the mark of love (for Rasulullah –Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) and for following the guidance of Rasool-e-Kareem (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) in all his affairs. Hence, eagerness for adopting the Sunnan of the Nabi and for emulating it is among the greatest treasures and noblest attributes. It (i.e. adherence to the Sunnah) is of the best acts of virtue and obedience. Therefore, O Brother Muslim! Make this incumbent on you.”

### ***IBN DAQEEQ ASH-SHAAFI’***

Like a drowning man clutching at straws, the deviate denigrator of the Sunnah, selectively citing Ibn Daqeeq Ash-Shaafi’, says:

*“The term ‘sunnah’ in the hadith literature- as highlighted by Imam Ibn al-Daqq in his Ihkam al-Ahkam and Sh. Abu Ghuddah (d.1997) in his short treatise on the issue – is not used in the technical definition of the later jurists that contrasts the term with ‘fard’ and ‘wajib’, but it rather takes a linguistic meaning (i.e. a ‘path’ or ‘way’).”*

The deviate meanders in confusion. The aforementioned quotation is not related to the discussion. It is not being contended that the term ‘Sunnah’ in the Hadith is confined to Sunnatul Muakkadah or that it has the technical meaning coined by the Fuqaha. The Hadith meaning of Sunnah is generic. It brings all acts of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam) within its purview regardless of the later classification by the Fuqaha. Thus, Muakkad and Ghair Muakkad, Fardh and Waajib all are within the scope of the meaning of Sunnah.

The discussion pertains to the contention that Sunnah Muakkadah does certainly come within the scope of the Hadith meaning which emphasizes practical implementation. Diversion from Sunnah of any class

will deprive the miserable character from the Shafaa-ah of Rasulullah (Sallallahu alayhi wasallam).

Confirming this well-established fact, Ibn Daqeeq states:

“Constancy in omission of anything from the Sunan is deficiency in one’s Deen and damaging to his adaalah. If his omission is due to indolence and disdain, then this will be fisq and deserving of censure. Our (Shaafi’) Ulama have said that if the people of a city are constant in abandoning a Sunnah, *qitaal (Jihaad with the Sword)* will be waged against them so that they return (to the Sunnah).

**“The Sahaabah and those after them assiduously upheld the Sunnah and Fadhaa-il (Mustahab) acts just as the Faraaidh were assiduously observed. They would not differentiate between these two (classes of Ahkaam) in the quest for Thawaab.”**  
*(Sharhul Ar’baeen of Ibn Daqeeq)*

Thus, Ibn Daqeeq did not minimize the imperative importance of observing for practical implementation even the Mustahab acts of the Sunnah. Fiqhi technicalities discussed by him and all the Fuqaha in no way whatsoever constitute a licence for minimizing the importance of even Mustahab/Sunnah Ghair Muakkadah acts.

Both Ibn Daqeeq and Shaikh Abu Ghuddah and all Fuqaha emphasize the strict observance of the Sunnah of all classes – of Muakkadah and Ghair Muakkadah – without distinguishing between them for purposes of practical implementation. The deviate's article is a satanic attempt to minimize the Sunnah. His selective extraction of statements from the Ulama and Fuqaha is a typical shaitaani trick of modernists and zanaadqah.

### ***ISRAAR-CONSTANCY***

The moron deviate states in his bunkum article:

*“It is very common to hear that missing an emphasised sunnah constitutes sin when done so ‘habitually’. However, there are several problems with this claim.*

*Firstly, to say that it is sinful if missed ‘habitually’ is to say that the sin is not intrinsic to the act of missing a sunnah, because were it intrinsic to the act of missing sunnah, it would be sinful irrespective of whether it was missed once or ten times..... There is no way to determine what exactly is meant by ‘habitual’.*

This puerile, flappedoodle argument is a veiled criticism of the illustrious Fuqaha and Ulama. Who had predicated omission with the term ‘habitual’?

Ibn Daqeeq whom the deviate has cited dishonestly to bolster his corrupt view, states: “*Whoever habitually omits anything from the Sunnah..... (Sharhul Ar’baeen).*”

In *Al-Furoo’ of Ibnul Muflih*, it is mentioned: “*Habitual omission of these Sunan is not permissible..... One who habitually abstains from the Sunan of Salaat is an evil person.*”

The Fuqaha have described the omission with the term ‘habitual’ despite the evil of omission not being reliant on the ‘habitual’ factor as it is abundantly clear from the many quotations recorded in this treatise.

The moron implies that the Fuqaha have ‘stupidly’ added the term. He argues that “*The absence of any parameters indicates that ‘habit’ is a loose stipulation for sin...*” This averment further nullifies his claim and understanding of the meaning of omitting Sunnah. The ‘absence of parameters’ confirms that regardless of the omission not being habitual, it remains sinful since ‘habitual is a loose stipulation’. Hence, whether the omission is

accompanied by habit or not, it remains sinful as is clear from the rulings of the Fuqaha.

In assailing the use of the term '*habitual*', the moron deviate has not limited his criticism to the Fuqaha. In fact he assails even the Qur'aan Majeed which employs this term without parameters. Praising the *Muhsineen* (*those who practice virtue*), Allah Ta'ala says:

*“They are those who remember Allah when they commit evil or oppress themselves (with sin), then they seek forgiveness for their sins. Who forgives sins other than Allah? And they (the Muhsineen) are not habitual in what they commit whilst they know (that is intentionally).” (Aal-e-Imraan 135)*

*“They used to habitually commit great sins.” (Al-Waaqiah, Aayat 46)*

The *israar* (*to commit habitually/persistently*) in these Qur'aanic verses is not defined with parameters. The Aayat says the people of lofty piety (the *Muhsineen*) do not '*habitually*' commit evil/sin. But the deviate says: *“There is no way to determine what exactly is meant by 'habitual'.* The corrupt reasoning with which he has endeavoured to dislodge what the Fuqaha have said, by implication is directed to Allah Ta'ala as well because no '*parameters*' have

been assigned to the term 'habitual' in the Qur'aan as well.

The deviate has negated sinfulness because of the absence of prescribed parameters to 'habitual'. He says: *"Firstly, to say that it is sinful if missed habitually is to say that the sin is not intrinsic to the act.....because if it was intrinsic to the act it would be sinful irrespective of whether it was missed once or ten times."*

In terms of his corrupt understanding it follows that if a sin is not committed habitually it will not be a sin. But the Qur'aan states that the Muhsineen do not sin habitually. Thus, according to the deviate's crooked logic, if a person commits an evil deed only once it will not be sinful due to absence of habit. But this is absolutely stupid and baseless. A sin will remain a sin even if committed only once and not habitually. Similarly, omission of Sunnah Muakkadah even once without valid cause remains sinful. The omission is intrinsically sinful regardless of the 'loose stipulation' of the term 'habitual'.

Regarding a 'loose stipulation' not being a condition for the sinful effect, the following Qur'aanic Aayat cites an example:

*“Do not compel your slave-women into prostitution if they desire to remain chaste, for gaining the wealth (boodle) of this worldly life.”*

*(An-Noor, Aayat 33)*

It does not follow from this ‘loose stipulation’ that it will be permissible to force the women into prostitution if their desire is **not** to be chaste, as is the case with prostitutes. Regardless of the slave-women having the desire to be chaste or not, it was haraam for their masters to force them into the trade of prostitution. Thus, even a confirmed prostitute who is bereft of any conception of chastity, may not be forced to commit zina.

Similarly, the ‘loose stipulation’ of ‘habitual’ is not an imperative condition on which the sin of omission is pivoted. Regardless of the omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah being once, its omission is sinful. The sin hinges on the condition of the omission being without valid reason. The attribute of ‘habitual’ is merely indicative of the fact that it is only a person who is addicted to omission of Sunnatul Muakkadah who omits the Sunnah.

A conscientious Muslim – a Muslim of Taqwa - will not intentionally omit even a Mustahab act without valid reason. Hence, the one who omits a Sunnat Muakkad act without valid reason is in reality a

faasiq who is an addict of omission. He is a habitual criminal, and only moron deviates seek to create obfuscation with the 'parameters' argument when even Allah Azza Wa Jal has not defined parameters for *israar (habitual)* commission and omission. Every sensible person understands what is habitual.

## **CONCLUSION**

The entire article of the moron deviate is a twaddle of mullock.