### What is the Ruling on Selling a House with the Condition of Buy-Back?

#### Darulifta Ahlesunnat (Dawateislami)

#### Question

What do the noble scholars and jurists of Islamic law say about the following: I needed Rs. 5 million to repay my debts. So, I sold my house, which is located in Sector 11F Karachi, valued between Rs. 6 million and Rs. 6.5 million, to my cousin for Rs. 5.5 million. There was also an agreement stating, "when I give you back the Rs. 5.5 million to you, you will return the house to me; however, you may live in it for now." This took place approximately three months ago. Recently, I attended an online session about the sharī'aĥ rulings about business, in which I found out that this method is impermissible. So, I wanted to know, is this actually impermissible? If so, why? Please provide some guidance about this.

#### **Answer**

# بِسُمِ اللهِ الرَّحُمٰنِ الرَّحِيْمِ المُعِوْنِ الْمَلِكِ الْوَهَّابِ النَّهُمَّ هِدَايَةَ الْحَقِّ وَالصَّوَابِ

In the situation described, the agreement that you made with your cousin was impermissible and sinful. It is clear from the details of the contract that your purpose was not to sell the house to your cousin; instead, it was to get the required amount of money to pay off your debt, and you temporarily gave the house to your cousin for this purpose. From a sharī'aĥ point of view, this is [بيح الوفاء] 'Bay' Wafa' which, according to the Sahih and reliable opinion, is a Rahn, i.e., a collateral. Since this is Rahn, it was not permissible for your cousin to reside in the home and derive benefit from it, because benefiting from Rahn is impermissible, sinful, and classified as riba. Therefore, because of this, the contract is also declared impermissible and a sin.

Furthermore, even if this were to be declared a general transaction, it would still be impermissible because the agreement to return the house upon paying back the money is contrary to the nature of the transaction, and neither is this part of the 'urf, i.e., the common practice of the people. Therefore, because of this, the transaction is fasid (void) and both parties must terminate it.

It is stated in al-Durr al-Mukhtar and Radd al-Muhtar regarding 'Bay Wafa':

(Al-Durr al-Mukhtar Ma'a Radd al-Muhtar, Vol. 5, p. 276, Publ. Dar al-Fikr) Mentioning its rulings, 'Allamah Shami عليه الرحمة states:

(Radd al-Muhtar, Vol. 5, p. 276, Publ. Dar al-Fikr)

A'la Hazrat, the Imam of Ahl-us-Sunnah عليه الرحمة writes:

والذى تقرروتحرران بيع الوفاء رهن لايزيد عليه بشيئ ولا يخالفه في شيئ قال العلامة خير الدين رملى في فتاواه: الذي عليه الاكثرانه رهن لا يفترق عن الرهن في حكم من الاحكام ــ فاذن لا يجوز لهذا الذي هو مشتر صورة مرتهن معنى الانتفاع بمشريه المرهون مطلقًا على ماهو الفتوى الآن للعلم بمقاصداهل الزمان وقد علم شرعاان المعهود عرفاكالمعهود شرطا

Translation: It is established that 'Bay' Wafa' is Rahn, neither is it anything more, and in no way contrary to it. Allamah Khair-Uddin Al-Ramli states in his Fatawa: The majority of the jurists hold the view that it is Rahn and it does not differ from Rahn in any ruling. Since it is Rahn, it is therefore not permissible for the apparent 'buyer', who in reality is the 'Murtahin', to derive any benefit from the Marhoon, i.e., the bought item. Considering the intention of the people of this era, fatwa is given according to this view. Through research, it is known in sharī'aĥ that whatever is common in 'urf is as if it is an implied condition. (Fatawa Razawiyah, Vol. 17, p. 644, Publ. Raza Foundation, Lahore)

It is stated in Bahar-e-Sharī'at:

سے الوفا حقیقت میں رہن ہے لوگوں نے رہن کے منافع کھانے کی یہ ترکیب نکالی ہے کہ بیج کی صورت میں رہن رکھتے ہیں تاکہ مرتہن اُس کے منافع سے مستفید ہو۔ لہٰذار ہن کے تمام احکام اس میں جاری ہوں گے۔ ۔ فقیر نے صرف اُس قول کوذکر کیا کہ یہ حقیقت میں رہن ہے کہ عاقدین کا مقصوداسی کی تائید کرتا ہے اور اگر اس کو بیج بھی قرار دیا جائے جیسا کہ اس کا نام ظاہر کرتا ہے اور خودعاقدین بھی عموماً لفظ بیج ہی سے عقد کرتے ہیں تو یہ شرط کہ ثمن واپس کرنا ہوگا یہ شرط بائع کے لیے مفید ہے اور مقتضائے عقد کے خلاف ہے اور ایسی شرط بیج کوفاسد کرتی ہے جیسا کہ معلوم ہوچکا ہے اس صورت میں بھی بائع ومشتری دونوں گئہگار بھی ہوں گے اور ببیع کے منافع مشتری کے لیے حلال نہ ہوں گے۔

Translation: Bay' al-Wafa', in reality, is a Rahn (collateral). People have devised this method to derive benefits from the Rahn. The method is that people give Rahn in the form of 'Bay' (a transaction) so that the Murtahin (the one who holds the collateral) can attain benefits from it. Therefore, all the rulings of Rahn will apply here. I have mentioned only the opinion that this is truly Rahn, because the intent of both parties indicates this. But even if we declare this to be a 'Bay' (as is clear from the name and because both parties commonly use the word Bay' when carrying out the transactions), the condition that "when the price is returned, the sold asset must be returned" benefits the seller, and it is contrary to the nature of the transaction. Such a condition causes the transaction to become fasid as you have already come to know. In this case, both the seller and the buyer are sinful, and the benefits attained from the asset will not be permissible for the buyer. (Bahar-e-Sharī'at, Vol. 2, p. 835, Publ. Maktaba-Tul-Madinah, Karachi)

وَاللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ عَزَّوَجَلَّ وَرَسُولُه أَعْلَم صَلَّى اللَّهُ تَعَالَى عَلَيْهِ وَالْهِ وَسَلَّم

(Allah Almighty knows best and His Messenger صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَالِهِ وَسَلَّم knows best.)

Answered By: Mufti Muhammad Qasim Attari

Ref No: HAB-0517

Date: 19th Sha'ban 1446 AH/ 18th February 2025



## Dar-ul-IftaAhlesunnat (Dawat-e-Islami)



www.fatwaqa.com



daruliftaahlesunnat



DaruliftaAhlesunnat



Dar-ul-ifta AhleSunnat

feedback@daruliftaahlesunnat.net