

**CLOSING THE MUSAAJID,  
SUSPENDING JUMUAH  
AND PROHIBITING  
JAMAA-AH SALAAT ARE  
OF THE HANDIWORK  
OF SHAITAAN**

**BY  
SHEIKH A.D. HAKIM AL-MUTAIRI**

Published by:  
The Majlis  
PO Box 3393, Port Elizabeth,  
6056, South Africa

***“They have (blatantly) opposed the Nass (Quraan and Hadith) and Ijmaa (consensus of the Ummat) and have innovated an evil practice in Islam. The sin of this innovation – the sin of the innovators and the sin of all those who follow this practice until the day of Qiyaamah will be borne by them (the innovators). They have opened the door to whoever wishes to close down the Masaajid. They have brazenly made the Masaajid defunct and proscribed the categorical Fardh acts merely on the basis of the specious argument of closing the door (for some future fitnah) by claiming the fear for contracting the disease.”***

***(Shaikh Al-Mutairi)***

***“Thus, citing the Ahaadith of performing Salaat in the residences which is an anomaly to (bolster the case of) closing every Musjid in the entire Arab world - (with the) suspension of the Jumua'h and Jamaa'ah, with the closure going on for two months, even in the towns, cities and countries wherein the plague is non-existent, is from the handiwork of Shaitaan and his gang and the fitnah of Dajjaal and his followers even though they may be dressed in the garb of the people of Islam and they may display the features of Islamic knowledge and Imaan.”***

***(Shaikh Al-Mutairi)***

# THE PROHIBITION OF SHUTTING DOWN THE MASAAJID

By Shaikh A.D. Hakim Al-Mutairi

19 Rajab 1441 AH March 14, 2020

**Question:** Assalamu Alaikum warahmatullahi  
wabarakaatuh

*Our Honorable Shaikh,  
With regards to your comments related to the fatwa which prohibits the (observance of) the five (daily) Salaats in the Masaajid in order to prevent the spread of the virus, is it not so that there is some scope of validity in their fatwa? i.e. (the principle of) warding off a greater evil (by committing the lesser of the two evils). Especially considering the fact that a person may unknowingly be a carrier of the virus in its inception stages and he then performs Salaat with the general (Muslim) public which could be a cause for the transmission of the virus.*

**Answer:** Wa alaikumus salaam warahmatullahi  
wabarakaatuh

May Allah grant you a long life.

The invalidity of the fatwa to close the Masaajid and to prevent Salaat out of fear of contracting the virus is not blurred and indiscernible to those who have recognised the reality of Islam, Imaan and Tauheed.

Leave alone those who are conversant with the auxiliary issues (of Islam, Imaan and Tauheed), this fatwa is not even befitting of those who are only conversant of the primary and fundamental issues (of Islam, Imaan and Tauheed). That fatwa is merely one of the (negative) effects of the rebellious, materialistic, secular Western culture which has transformed man into a profit generating commodity over which, in the name of socialism, it's destruction and the material loss which will be borne by the state is feared; or, in the name of freedom and liberation, this Western culture has transformed man into a god which is to be worshipped instead of Allah to the extent that this worldly life of prosperity is more important to them than to the prosperity of man's Deen, Imaan and Aakhirat as espoused by Islam which has legislated Jihaad and fighting in the path of Allah and spending our lives and wealth in order for the Ahkaam (laws) of Islam to prevail.(Allah Ta'ala says):

*“And fight them (the disbelievers) until there no longer remains fitnah (shirk and disbelief) and worship is only done for Allah.”*

*“And who is more oppressive than those who proscribe the name of Allah from being mentioned in the Masaajid?”*

The Fuqaha have unanimously agreed that the protection of Deen is foremost and the most essential of the five essentials which precede the protection of life. Hence, establishing the laws of Islam is a fundamental of Deen even though it (may entail and) leads to loss of lives.

The protection of Deen takes first priority over protection of lives, and from the ways and means of protecting the Deen, is the establishment of the Zikr of Allah in His Masaajid and enlivening the Masaajid with the five (daily) Salaats, Jumuah and Jamaa'ah (congregational Salaats), regardless of whether Jamaat is Fard-e-Ayn or Fard-e-Kifaayah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned in *Majmooul Fataawa* (31/255): *“It is not permissible to lock the Masaajid thereby preventing from the purposes for which it was erected.”*

Al Aini has mentioned in *Al Binaayah Sharhul Hidaayah Lil Marghinaani Fi Fiqhil Hanafiyyah*: *“It is abominable for the door of the Musjid to be locked since it is tantamount to preventing (people) from Salaat, i.e. since locking (the Musjid) is tantamount to preventing (people), it is abominable. This is based on the Words of Allah Ta'ala: ‘And who is more oppressive than the one who proscribes the Name of Allah from being remembered in the Masaajid?’*

In the year 1316, the Ulama of Egypt were asked about disallowing people (going for) Hajj from Egypt on account of an epidemic in Hijaaz (Saudi Arabia). They unanimously passed the verdict that it is impermissible to proscribe (people from fulfilling) the obligation of Hajj.

The cabinet met for a special meeting to discuss this issue of proscribing Hajj which the Marine Health Ministry

deemed imperative in order to prevent the spread of the epidemic from Hijaz to Egypt. However, since proscribing (people from performing) Hajj entails prohibiting Muslims from a primary, Deeni fundamental, it was not appropriate for the cabinet to ratify anything until the Ulama are consulted.

For this reason, the secretary invited the Eminent Chief Qadhi (Judge) of Egypt and his associates, the Honourable Shaikh of Al Azhar, the Chief Mufti of Egypt, the Mufti of Al Haqqaaniyyah, Shaikh Abdur Rahman An Nawaawi and the ex- Chairman of the Council Al Alami.

They participated in the meeting and engaged in discussions with the cabinet. After the meeting was terminated, the Ulama gathered and unanimously agreed that the following fatwa should be written and sent to the cabinet. The fatwa is (hereunder reproduced) verbatim:

"All praise is due to Allah alone.

... Not one of the Aimmah (Fuqaha) has mentioned that the *non-existence* of a widespread virus/ disease in Hijaz is a precondition for the obligation of performing Hajj. Hence, the existence of any virus/ disease in Hijaz does not counteract the obligation of performing Hajj on one who has the ability (to perform Hajj). Based on this, despite the prevalence of this disease/ virus, it is not permissible to prohibit those who intend leaving for Hajj when they have the means and ability to do so.

As for the prohibition mentioned in the Ahaadith of entering a place which is afflicted by a plague, its context/applicability is where a stronger (Shar'i objective), like the performance of a Fardh act, does not oppose it. This is what is understood from the explanations of our Ulama.

Furthermore, the prohibition (in the Hadith) is conditional based on the belief of the person who intends to enter or leave (the plague stricken area) as is explained in *Tanweerul Absaar*, the text of *Ad Durrul Mukhtaar* as follows:

*'When he leaves a city which is afflicted by a ta'oon, i.e. an epidemic, if he believes that everything occurs through the decree of Allah Ta'ala, then there is no problem for him to leave and enter (that plague stricken city). However, if it is his belief that if he leaves, he will be saved, and if he enters, he will be afflicted with the plague, then it is Makrooh (Tahreemi-Prohibited) for him to enter/leave. Hence, he will not (be permitted to) enter or leave'.*

*The commentator As Sindi has corroborated it (the explanation given above). And Allah knows best." 2 Zul Qa'dah 1316"*

The materialistic (atheistic), Western mindset has missed the point as to how to deal with the Corona virus by restricting the issue to only corporeal medical treatment such as precautionary measures, preventative measures and medical treatment. This Western mindset has isolated and cut off the link (between the Corona virus on the one hand) and the realm of unseen and the spiritual treatment

which prescribes repentance to Allah, turning to Him (to ease and remove this virus), supplicating to Him alone, placing our trust in Him, preserving and exercising patience in the face of His test, being pleased with His decree and keeping His greatness in mind. This is the reality of Islam (submitting to Allah) and Imaan (believing) in Allah.

Citing the issue of warding off a *mafsadah* (evil/calamity - the virus) and preventing the spread (of the virus) as proof for shutting down the Masaajid and to prohibit the performance of Faraaidh (Fardh acts such as Salaat, Hajj, etc.), is a form of the secular, materialistic outlook which is cloaked (in the form of) a Deeni Fatwa. *(While in reality it is a massive shaitaani deception. – The Majlis)*

The occurrence of a plague is not a new development which requires (Ulama to exercise) ijtihaad and (issue) a new fatwa. Plagues and epidemics were prevalent in the era of Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallaam) and he had explained the laws related to it in detail. Never did he permit the Masaajid to be locked down and Salaat in the Masaajid to be abandoned. Rather, he prohibited people from entering and leaving a plague stricken area and (enjoined), e.g. an infected (camel) should not mingle with a healthy (camel).

*(In fact this statement of the Honourable Shaikh is not confirmed by any Nass. Right up until the moment of the departure of Hadhrat Umar (Radhiyallahu anhu) from Shaam on the occasion of the Plague of Amwaas, even the Sahaabah were not aware that entry into a plague-stricken locality was proscribed by Rasulullah –Sallallahu*

*alayhi wasallam. This fact came to light by the extremely belated narration of Hadhrat Abdur Rahmaan Bin Auf – Radhiyallahu anhu, and it was on this basis that Hadhrat Umar –Radhiyallahu anhu – had decided not to enter although later Hadhrat Umar –Radhiyallahu anhu- had expressed regret and recited Istighfaar for not having entered. Therefore, the analogy of the camel should be confined to camels, and this was on account of the corrupt embedded belief of contagion in which the people believed. Insaan is not a camel or a donkey.-The Majlis)*

However, he had totally and absolutely negated the occurrence of contagion (with such emphasis which preclude scope for ambiguity) and which substantiates (the non-existence of contagion) with an (easily comprehensibly) self-evident daleel (proof). Thus, Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam said: **"There is no contagion"**, and he added (in negation of contagion): *"Who transmitted the disease to the first (camel)?"*. And he further said: *"Nothing transmits the disease to something else"*. (In response), a Bedioun queried: *"(You get) a camel infected by mangy (amongst other healthy camels) and then all the camels (become infected) with mangy"*. Rasulullaah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam replied (in negation): *"So who infected the first (camel)? There is no contagion and no ill omen in the month of Safar. Allah has created every soul and has (already) ordained it's lifespan, it's sustenance and the calamities it will face"*.

When Ibn Umar (radiallahu anhu) had purchased an infected camel and it was feared that it will infect (the other camels), he said: *"We are pleased with the*

*proclamation of Rasulullaah (sallallahu alayhi wasallaam): "There is no contagion". (Saheehul Bukhaari)*

*(This indicates that it is not valid to infer contagion from the Hadith of a sick camel – The Majlis)*

The Hadith: *"There is no contagion"*, has been transmitted copiously from more than 10 Sahaabah radiallahu anhum: Abu Huraira, Ibn Umar, Jaabir, Anas (in Saheehain), Ibn Abbaas (in Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan), Sa'd Bin Abi Waqqaas (in Musnad Ahmed and As Saheehah Lidhiyaa Al Maqdisi), Abdullah Bin Amr Bin Al Aas, Ibn Masood (in Tirmizi and Musnad Ahmed with good chains of narration), As Saaib Bin Yazeed, Abu Umaamah, Umair Bin Sa'd (in Mu'jamut Tabraani) and Abu Saeed Al Khudri (in Tahaawi).

Haafiz Ibn Hajar has mentioned in Al Fath (10/ 160): The Hadith: *"**There is no contagion**"*, has been corroborated by chains of transmission from besides Abu Hurairah (radiallahu anhu). The Hadith is transmitted authentically from Aisha, Ibn Umar, Sa'd Bin Abi Waqqaas, Jaabir and others (radiallahu anhum).

Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam has negated contagion and has commanded (the adoption of) health protection at the time of the occurrence of a plague. *(While there is no proscription for the adoption of health measures (not kuffaar and satanic protocols), the command mentioned by the Honourable Shaikh is questionable-The Majlis)*. Hence, those who pass verdicts for the Masaajid to be locked and prohibiting healthy persons *(and even sick*

*persons –The Majlis*) from the five (daily) Salaats, Jumuah and Jamaa'ah (congregational Salaats) in the Masaajid, they have defied Allah and His Rasool and have validated what Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam has (explicitly) negated. They have used this (pronouncement of the Hadith) as a means to contradict his Shariat (which dictates that the Masaajid should remain open).

They have (blatantly) opposed the Nass (Quraan and Hadith) and Ijmaa (consensus of the Ummat) and have innovated an evil practice in Islam. The sin of this innovation – the sin of the innovators and the sin of all those who follow this practice until the day of Qiyaamah will be borne by them (the innovators). They have opened the door to whoever wishes to close down the Masaajid. They have brazenly made the Masaajid defunct and proscribed the categorical Fardh acts merely on the basis of the specious argument of closing the door (for some future fitnah) by claiming the fear for contracting the disease.

The causes of fear are many such as wars, civil unrest, (etc.). (Hence, when there are many causes of fear), (adopting the pretext of fear to close the Masaajid) will make the Masaajid vulnerable to state interference. The authorities/ government will close it whenever they wish on the pretext of the 'best interests' (of the people) whereas the factor - the existence of plagues and epidemics - which (in their understanding) called for brazenness like this (to close the Masaajid) was found in the era of Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam.

There was a plague in Madinah which would afflict every person who entered it for the first time but, (despite this), it is not narrated from Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam that he had granted a concession for Jumua'h and Jamaa'ah to be suspended on account of that. Hence, the invalidity of clinging to this specious argument is a confirmed fact. Rather, the principle of closing the door (to foreseeable fitnah) demands that the government be prevented from being brazen in closing the Masaajid, suspending Jumua'h, Jamaa'ah and the five (daily) Salaats and from interfering in these aspects in this manner since it (actually entails) opening a wide door of evil. Instead of interfering and meddling in the Masaajid and Salaat, it is possible for the government to prevent people from leaving their homes (but, it is not possible for them to) close the Masaajid and prevent the five (daily) Salaats in the Masaajid. This is not in the interests of the Masaajid. The trusteeship of the country over the Masaajid is a trusteeship of custody and administration, not authority to prevent (from Salaat), to close and to make (the Masaajid) inoperative!

*(We differ with the Honourable Shaikh regarding a government having Shar'i permission to prevent people from leaving their homes due to a plague. This view is not supported by any Hadith. Furthermore, such prevention is tantamount to rendering the Musajjid inoperative and desolate which is severely castigated and proscribed by the Qur'aan. Prohibiting people from leaving their homes to attend the Musjid is the same as preventing them from Salaat in the Musjid. This is haraam. Preventing them leaving their homes for any other lawful purpose is also*

*haram. It is oppression which has no basis and no support in the Shariah – The Majlis).*

The negation of contagion by Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallaam) and his citation as proof of a logical phenomenon - "*Then who had transmitted (the disease) to the first infected (camel)*" - is corroborated by the fact that diseases and viruses are in existence and, at times, by the decree of Allah, like how the disease surfaced in the first infected person, a person is exposed to it and contracts the virus on account of his body and immunity being unable to fight it and, at other times, he does not contract the virus on account of his strong immunity as is observed (by one and all). Hence, every person who comes into contact with an infected person does not contract the virus. The cause of (contracting) the virus is not contagion itself and merely coming into contact with an infected person. Rather, the cause is the weak immunity of the body which cannot fight it. Hence, keeping away (from infected persons) is a (form of) protection from the virus, not that contagion is the cause and sickness. (*This logic of the Honourable Shaikh is incongruous—The Majlis*)

Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam has said: "*Allah has not sent down any sickness except that there is a cure for it*".

The plague was widespread (and intense) in Shaam (Syria) during the era of Umar (radhiyallahu anhu). It did not result in them suspending Jumuah and Jamaa'ah (congregational Salaats) or in them proscribing its performance in the Masaajid. Likewise, (it did not result in them proscribing) Janaazah Salaat which is Fardh

Kifaayah as is (narrated) in Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah from Amr Bin Muhaajir that he said: *"I performed (Janaazah) Salaat with Waasilah Bin As Asqa radiallahu anhu over sixty deceased persons - men and women - who (had passed away) on account of the plague. He made four takbeers and one salaam"*.

This type of innovated proscription is unknown in the entire history of Muslims despite the fact that a plague is more dangerous in comparison to the Corona virus. Hence, death from the plague is certain as opposed to covid where the death rate does not exceed 2%. This (in itself - that the death rate is so low) negates the designation of it being a dangerous disease which necessitates the closure of the Masaajid and proscribing Jumuah and Jamaa'ah for the healthy (*and for even the sick who wish to attend –The Majlis*). How can it ever be that millions of Muslims are prevented from their Masaajid and establishing the Faraaidh and the salient features of Deen on account of a mere hundred or two hundred infected persons whereas Salaat is the Pillar of Deen in Islam!

Those who have issued fatwas to close the Masaajid and suspend Jummuah and Jamaa'ah Salaat have no Nass (Quraan/ Hadith basis), no Qiyaas (valid principled analogical reasoning) and no fatwa of a credible Imaam (to back their fatwas). Rather, political motives have today rendered the Masaajid and Salaat insignificant and have excised these vital acts of ibaadat from the lives of Muslims to the extent that the Masaajid were closed prior

to the closure of commercial markets (*in fact commercial institutions and markets remain open –The Majlis*).

Their citation (as proof) of the Hadith: "*(Perform) Salaat at home*" at the time of intense cold and violent gale force winds (is incorrect) since the Hadith does not call for the closure of the Masaajid nor does it prohibit those who wish to act on the conventional norm.

The factor of fear (during storms) is a concession to abstain from the obligation of Jumuah and Jamaa'ah for the person alone who is afflicted with fear. It is not an excuse or a basis for closing the Masaajid and preventing those who have no fear from establishing Jamaa'ah Salaat.

Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam had performed Salaat in his Musjid (Musjid un Nabawi) and had made sajdah in (a mixture of) water and sand on account of a heavy downpour as is narrated in Bukhaari and Muslim. There is not a single narration mentioning that he and those who lived in the vicinity of the Musjid ever performed Salaat in their homes on account of rain, cold or the plague which would afflict every person who entered Madinah. Rather, he would perform Salaat in his Musjid. He only made a concession for them to combine two Salaats at times of rain and made a concession for those who were unable to make it the Musjid due the floodwaters to perform Salaat at home without the Jamaa'ah Salaat being suspended in the Musjid.

The (words) "*(Perform) Salaat in (your) residences*" (added to) the Azaan was originally only prescribed

during journeys. The Sahaabah (then) adopted (this practice) also when not on journey. Leave alone closing the Musjid, the (addition of the words: "*(Perform) Salaat in (your) residences*" in the Azaan) does not necessitate the suspension of Jamaa'ah Salaat and the cessation of frequenting the Musjid. It is just a concession for those whom the rain and cold make difficult their (movement to the Musjid). Hence, they will perform Salaat in their homes. Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam only prescribed this (addition of the words: "*(Perform) Salaat in (your) residences*" in the Azaan) in (the course of) journey. He then performed Salaat with those who were with him and permitted the (rest of the) people to perform Salaat in their residences. There is no Musjid found (while) on journey (in the countryside) which will result in it being disused and closed down.

*(Residences in the context of the proclamation on a journey refer to the tents set up during a halt in the journey. There was no Musjid when this pronouncement was originally made –The Majlis)*

It appears in Bukhaari and Muslim: Ibn Umar gave Azaan on a cold night at Dijnaan - a mountain close to Makkah - thereafter he said: "*Perform Salaat in your residences.*" He then informed us that Rasulullaah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam would command the Muazzin on cold or rainy nights (while) on journey to give Azaan and immediately thereafter say: "*Behold! Perform Salaat in your residences.*"

And in one narration, it is mentioned: *“We observed that it was raining when we were with Rasulullaah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam at the time of (the treaty of) Hudaibiyah. The rain did not (even) wet the lower portion of our shoes and the announcer of Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallam called out: Perform Salaat in your residences.”*

Hence, Salaat in the residences is a concession when there is a (valid) excuse and it is not the conventional norm (according to) the consensus of the Fuqaha as (attested to) in (the narration of) Jaabir in Saheeh Muslim: He said: *“We were out with Rasulullah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam on a journey and it rained. He (Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam) said: “Whoever wishes, may perform his Salaat in his residence”.*

The statement of Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam: *“Whoever wishes, may perform his Salaat in his residence”* is a concession and is not the conventional norm. Thus, attending the Jamaa'ah in the Musjid and performing Salaat with the Imaam, are indisputably more virtuous. Hence, those who prevent people from attending the Jamaa'ah most certainly fall within the purview of the generality (*Umoom*) of the Ayat: *“Who is more oppressive than the one who prevents (others) from the Masaajid of Allah”*, i.e. there is no one more ungrateful and more rebellious than such persons.

Ibn Hajar has replied to the (apparent) contradiction of the Muazzin's statement: *“Come for Salaat (to the Musjid)”* and his statement: *“Perform Salaat in (your) residences”.*

He states in *Al Fath* - 2/113- “Without being cornered by what was mentioned, it is possible to reconcile between both (apparently contradictory statements) by (replying) that the purport of *"(Perform) Salaat in (your) residences"* is a concession for whoever wishes to adopt the concession and the purport of *"Come for Salaat"* is encouragement for those who intend to secure the complete virtue even though they have to bear some difficulty. The Hadith of Jaabir in Muslim corroborates this. He (Jaabir) said: *"We came out with Rasulullaah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam on a journey and it rained. Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam thus said: 'Whoever of you wishes may perform his Salaat in his residence.'"*

Thus, citing the Ahaadith of performing Salaat in the residences which is an anomaly to (bolster the case of) closing every Musjid in the entire Arab world - (with the) suspension of the Jumua'h and Jamaa'ah, with the closure going on for two months, even in the towns, cities and countries wherein the plague is non- existent, is from the handiwork of Shaitaan and his gang and the fitnah of Dajjaal and his followers even though they may be dressed in the garb of the people of Islam and they may display the features of Islamic knowledge and Imaan.

The continual practice of the Muslims was to always hasten to the Musjid to make Dua and Istighfaar as per the Sunnat when a plague broke out. There is absolutely no mention of even one of the Aimmah who had given a fatwa for the closure of the Masaajid and restraining people from the Masaajid out of fear of the plague!

The Hanafi Mazhab has cited as proof the generality of the Hadith: When you see/ experience some unrest/ anxiety, then hasten to (perform) Salaat. (The author of *Ar Raddul Muhtaar*) said in the footnotes of *Ad Durrul Mukhtaar*: "*Unrest/ anxiety*": *i.e. an overwhelming fear for the enemy. "Included in it is making Dua for the ending of the plague"*: He (the author) intended (performing) Salaat in order to make Dua (thereafter) by the word Dua. (The author) said in *An Nahr*: "*When they gather (in the Musjid), each one will perform two Rakaats Salaat (individually) intending (to seek aid in supplicating) for the ending of the plague with (those) two Rakaats.* (The basis for these two Rakaats is) the statement of Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam: When you see / experience some unrest/ anxiety, then hasten to (perform) Salaat.

The objectives of the Shariah are attained not by curbing the laws of the Shariah, but by establishing and fulfilling the laws. There is no one who is more knowledgeable than Rasulullaah sallallahu alayhi wasallaam regarding Allah, and His objectives. There were plagues in the era of Nabi sallallahu alayhi wasallaam (yet, despite this), he did not proscribe the Muslims from (performing) Jumuah and Jamaa'ah, nor did he close the Musjid due to fear of contagion. Rather, he (emphatically) stated: "*There is no contagion*" and he commanded: "*When a plague breaks out in an area and you are in that area then, do not leave it*".

The fatwa of proscribing (people from going to the Masajid) was based on the principle of "closing the door (to future fitnah)". The (correct) purport (of this principle)

is prohibiting a permissible means when it leads to some *mafsadah* (corruption in Deen), e.g. the prohibition of selling grapes to a person who will ferment it into wine - not the general prohibition of the sale of grapes nor the prohibition of farming grapes, since the Shariah has not prohibited that.

Nevertheless, (this principle in itself) is a point of contention (since it is not a unanimously accepted principle) and (either way), not one of the (Fuqaha) who had cited this principle as proof (for other issues had ever) asserted that this principle may be used to suspend Fardh e Ain or Fardh e Kifaayah acts. ....

*(End of the Shaikh's Discourse)*

### **Our Comment**

Despite the Shaikh being somewhat liberal and having erred in some respects in his discourse, he has made it abundantly clear that closing the Musajid, suspending Jumuah and the Jamaa'ah Salaat are haraam and acts of Shaitaan. There is absolutely no basis in the Shariah for the innovation of this haraam abomination which is tantamount to abrogating the Deen.